

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
ESSENCE AND UNITY
OF THE
CHVRCH CATHOLIKE VISIBLE.

AND
The Priority thereof in regard of
Particular CHURCHES.

In answer to the Objections made against it, both
by Mr *John Ellis* junior, and by that Reverend and
worthy Divine Mr *Hooker*, in his *Survey*
of Church Discipline.

By SAMUEL HUDSON Minister of the Gospel
at *Capell in Suff.* *K*



LONDON,

Printed by *A. M.* for *Christopher Meredith* at the Signe of the
Crane in *Pauls Church-yard.* 1650.



TO THE
Reverend Assembly of DIVINES
assembled at Westminster.



Everend, and much honoured Fathers and Brethren,
it is a received Maxime, that publike rights and
interests are to be preferred before private and par-
ticular; spiritual, before secular; divine before
humane. Now as the internal spiritual gover-
ment of Christ in the invisible Church, is farre more
excellent then any other: so also his external visible government of
the visible Church, hath the preheminence above all visible civil
governments and Kingdoms of this world. And if it be lawful even
for private persons to vindicate, by humane Laws, the extents and
rights of their particular civil inheritances and possessions: and if
it be accounted the duty of good subjects to vindicate the extents and
rights of their civil Sovereigns Dominions, with their Estates and
Lives, even by the Sword: then much more is it the duty of Christs
Subjects, by disputes and argumentations to vindicate the extents
and rights of Christs external political Kingdom; the one being but
of civil concernment, the other divine; the one tending but to a
civil end, the other a spiritual. And therefore I hope none will
blame me for appearing in publike to contend for the extent and
rights of Christs political Kingdom in his Church here on earth.

My first Thesis on this Subject was composed for the private
use of my self, and some few neighbour Ministers, in a monethly
private meeting, according to our custome. But being made pub-
like, at the desires of others, it met with opposition from two re-
verend Brethren: first by M. John Ellis junior, who undertook
to confute it, with other Tractates of divers of my betters that were
in the same cause: and secondly by Reverend M. Hoob-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

ker, who is since departed out of the visible militant Church, into the invisible Triumphant; the losse of which burning and shining light, the Church of God cannot sufficiently lament. Now because some things therein set down were by them mistaken, and other things not so fully cleared, as I desired, I thought good to set it out again more enlarged, and vindicated from the mistakes and oppositions that it met withall.

The reasons of my so long delay herein were, First, because I was the least and least concerned therein, though the most tartly dealt withall by M. Ellis. And secondly, because I desired to see some of my betters go before me, in vindication of their own Tractates of the same subject. And thirdly, because I understood by M. Ellis's book, and by common fame, that there was an answer to M. Rutherford coming out, wherein I should finde my question discussed, by that eminent and worthy Divine M. Hooker, which was indeed sent over, but perished in the sea, and so was retarded one year longer, until it could be transcribed, and sent over again. And since that was printed, the seat of the warre, by the siege of Colchester, coming so near us, we were all in a fear and danger, so that I thought it no fit time to attend to controversies: and I had indeed almost laid it quite aside, but that the importunities of some, and the insultings of others excited me again to take it in hand.

And now I finde a fourfold unhappinesse hath betided me herein. First, The darknesse and sublimity of the Subject, which I could no way make plain, so as to be understood by vulgar apprehensions, because the handling thereof put me necessarily upon the use of so many Latine words, and logical terms of art, which are not usually understood by common people. And therefore despairing to be understood but by those that had some skill in the Latine tongue, and in Logick, I have set down the words of such Authors as I have had occasion to cite, in their own languages, in which I found them, lest otherwise this Tractate should smell too great.

A second unhappinesse is, that this Tenet seemeth to crosse so many of our own Divines, in their writings against the Papists. But indeed it doth only seem so, for it is manifest that the Church Catholike which they intend, is not the same with this that I have to deal about. For they speak of the Church Catholike consistinge only of the Elect, and I consent unto them that that Church is visible;

The Epistle Dedicatory.

but my question is about the external state of the Church, containing hypocrites as well as those that are truly godly, in which Church the Ordinances of worship and discipline were set.

A third is, that I am fallen upon a subject wherein I can finde so few going before me, and therefore could have the lesse help from Authours.

A fourth is, that I being a mean Countrey-Minister, want both those abilities and opportunities, to enable me to write of controversies, having constant employment of preaching in mine own Congregation, and frequently abroad, lying upon me, so that I cannot attend polemical Divinity, as they must that undertake such a work.

My principal scope in this and the former Thesis, is to prove that there is one Church Catholike visible on earth: and that Gods intention and donation of the Ordinances of worship and discipline, was first to the whole Church, and secondarily to the particular Churches; as parts thereof. And yet I acknowledge the ordinary and constant exercise of those Ordinances is primarily in the particular Churches, and a secondary and only occasional exercise of them in greater parts thereof; and a very rare exercise of them in the whole conjunctim upon some general extraordinary occasion, and that can be no otherwise, then by delegated Commissioners from the several parts of the whole, when convenient.

If it be conceived by any that some of the Arguments in this Treatate are multiplied more then is needfull, and are laid down more singly then was meet, I will not deny it: Be pleased in the reading of them to consider them together, and I hope they will prove conclusive.

I finde also by the review of this Treatate, that some things are offer touched upon then I was aware of: be pleased to impute it partly to my forgetfulnesse, and partly to mine endeavour to follow the method of my former Thesis, and yet to answer what was objected against it by others, who followed their own methods, which occasioned some coincidency.

And since the transcribing of it for the Presse, there came to my hands two other Treatates about the same subject, written from N. E. the one in Latine by that reverend and worthy M. Norton, Minister at Ipswich there, in answer to Apollonius; the other by

The Epistle Dedicatory.

unto reverend Ministers, viz. M. Allen, and M. Shepard, in answer to M. Ball.

It grieved me much that I saw them no sooner: I have only inserted a few annotations upon these tractates, because I was loth to make a Postscript; and because I found that most of the material passages in them concerning this subject, were already spoken unto in this book.

I have now shewed mine opinion on this question, and submit it to your sage and mature judgements, and should be glad that my betters would shew me theirs, and either correct what I have erred or failed in, or make more clear what I have endeavoured to prove and defend. If I have herein erred, I would not willingly be an heretick, but shall be willing upon conviction and proof to retract the same, but if I have defended a truth (as I conceive I have) I should be glad to be confirmed in it, and gladder to have the truth confirmed, that it may appear so to others.

Now God the Father, who is the God of truth; and Jesus Christ, who is the way, the truth; and the life; and the holy Ghost, who is the Spirit of truth; guide you and us into all truth. So prayeth,

Your unworthy fellow-labourer

Septemb. 8.

in the Lord,

1649.

SAMUEL HUDSON.

AN
EPISTLE
TO THE
READER.



He Reverend Authour of this learned Tractate, some few years ago, did put forth a Book about the *Essence and Unity of the Church-Catholike visible, and the priority thereof in regard of particular Churches.* This Book was written with so much ingenuity, perspicuity, and learning, that Reverend and godly M. Hooker is pleased to passe his judgement upon the Authour and his Book in these words; *While I was enquiring and writing touching this Ecclesia Catholica visibilis, an especial providence brought a book to my view, which did purposely entreat of this particular subject. The Author M. Hudson a learned man and a faithful Minister of the Gospel, when I had considered his writing six years, I found his judgement sharp and scholasticall, his spirit Christian and moderate, his expression succinct and pregnantly plain to expresse his own apprehensions: So that my heart was much contented with the acumen and judicious diligence of the Authour, though I could not consent to what he writ, yet I could not but unfainedly prize the learning, perspicuity and painfullnesse expressed in his writing. To this Book (by him so much commended) he returns an answer, and before him one M. John Ellis junior. And it seems there are two other Tractates about the same subject written from N. E. The one by M. Norton in answer to Apollonius, the other by M. Allen and M. Shepherd in answer to M. Ball. For the truth is, the position there held forth, if granted, would utterly overthrow*

Survey of
Church-disci-
pline. pag. 15.

To the Reader.

the grounds and pillars of the Congregational government. For if there be a Church-Catholike visible, and this Church be not only a Church-Entire but a Church-Organical, and a Totum integrale having all Church-power habitually seated in the Officers of it, which they have commission from Christ to exert, and put into act upon a lawful call. And if particular Congregations are integral parts and members of the Church-Catholike, as the Jewish Synagogues were of the Jewish Church. And if the Ministry, Ordinances, and censures were given by Christ first to the Church-general-visible, and secondarily to the Church-particular, Then it will necessarily follow, That the particular Congregation is not the first receptacle of Church-power, And that all Church-power is not intirely and independently in a particular Congregation, which are two of the chief foundations of the Congregational government. I shall not at all speak to the first, but as for this last, That all Church-power is solely and independently in a particular Congregation, it seems to me not only to be contrary to the Scriptures, but to the very light of nature, and to carry many great absurdities with it. For,

* Act. 15.
Mat. 18. 17.
Deut. 17. 8, 9,
10, 11, 12.
1 Tim. 4. 14.

1. It takes away all authoritative appeals, and all authoritative waies of uniting particular Churches one with another.

2. Then the Churches of Jesus Christ should have no Church-communication in discipline one with another. They may have Christian-communication, but no Church-communication.

3. Then no Minister could preach as an Officer out of his own Congregation, but only as a gifted brother and as a private Christian.

4. Then no Minister could administer the Sacraments (which is an act of office) out of his own Congregation, nor (as I conceive) give the Sacrament to a member of another Congregation.

5. Then when his particular Church is dissolved, he ceaseth to be a Minister, and must receive a New Ordination.

6. Then a Minister baptizing a childe, baptizeth him only into his own Congregation. For if he be not an Officer of the Catholike Church, he cannot baptize into the Catholike Church.

To the Reader

which is directly contrary to 1 Cor. 12. 13.

7. Then when the Officers excommunicate a person, he should only be excommunicated out of that particular Congregation, & not out of the whole Church.

8. Then Christ should have as many intire bodies, as particular Congregations; Christ should not only have one Body whereof particular Congregations are part, but every Congregation should be a Body of Christ by it self.

9. It would make way for toleration of heresies and blasphemies, and let in as many religions as there are particular Congregations.

10. It would make the Churches of Christ stand divided one from another in respect of government, and thereby bring ruine upon one another. Even as in a civil State, if particular Corporations should be independent from the whole in point of government, it would quickly bring destruction upon the whole.

For the removing of these and such like absurdities, This learned and indiduous Author in the Book fore-mentioned laid down a quite contrary Thesis. That there is a Catholike, visible, organick Church, to which Ordinances and censures are strictly given by Jesus Christ. And that every Minister is seated by God in this Catholike visible Church, and hath a virtual and habitual power to preach as a Minister in any place where he shall be lawfully called. Indeed he is not an actual Minister of the Church Catholike, nor hath actually the charge of the whole Church as the Apostles had; but habitually only by reason of the indefinitenesse of his office. He hath power in *actu primo* by virtue of his office, though not in *actu secundo seu exercitio* he hath *ius ad rem* every where, but not *in re* any where, without a call. He is a Minister of Jesus Christ, and thereby hath right and power to perform the acts belonging to his office, but for the execution of it, there is required a call thereunto.

This position is opposed and confuted by the fore-named Authors. And in answer to them (but especially to Mr. Hooker and Mr. Ellis) This Reverend Minister hath here written a Vindication, which he hath done with so much meeknesse,

moderation, ingenuity, perspicuity and learning, that if that holy man of God Mr. Hooker were alive, I doubt not but he would passe the same judgement upon this Book which he did upon the former. The truth is, The Question is full of difficulty and intricacy, the path in which he walks is an *un-
trodden path*, and the pains which he hath taken in the compiling of this work, and the learning which he hath discovered herein is so great, as I am very confident, *That whosoever reads the Book will commend the Author and his abilities, though he should not in every thing respect his opinion.* The Scope of the Book is to contend for the extents and rights of Christs political Kingdom in his Church upon earth, and to demonstrate the unity of it, and thereby to lay a foundation of unity between particular Churches, which is as necessary for the preservation of them, as purity and verity. *For a Church divided against it self cannot stand.*

Sad it is to consider, That whereas Jesus Christ hath left two waies for the uniting of Christians in faith and love, the devil should make use of both of them to disunite and divide us. The first is, *The Sacrament of the Lords Supper*, which was instituted to be a *Feast of Love*, and a *Band of Union* between Christians, but by Satans cunning it hath proved an *apple of strife* and of great contention, not only between the *Papists* and the *Protestants*, the *Lutherans* and the *Calvinists*, but between us also, and our dissenting brethren. The second is, *The Government of the Church*, which was ordained by Christ to be *unity*, and as a *golden chain* to link them together in purity, verity and unity, to heal breaches, and to make us minde the same things, and to be perfectly joynted together in the same minde, and in the same judgement, But by the devils policy (whose property it is to bring evil out of good) it is become the great bone of contention, and a *middle wall of partition* between Christians and Christians. This is a lamentation, and shall be for a lamentation.

But my comfort is, That Jesus Christ came into the world to remove the *wall of partition* that was between Jew and Gentile, and to make both one, and he is not only a foundation stone for his people to build their faith and hope upon, but

To the Reader.

also a corner stone to unite beleevers one to another. He it is that will shortly remove all these *Wals of partition* between brethren, and will become not only our Redeemer, but our Peace-maker. For he hath praied for all those that should beleeve in him, *That they may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one with us, that the world may beleeve that thou hast sent us. And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given them, that they may be one even as we are one.* This Praier will in due time be fulfilled, together with those three soul-comforting Prophecies concerning the times of the New Testament, *Ier. 32.39. Zeph. 3.9. Zach. 14.9.* In the mean time it is our duty to study *unity* as well as *unity*. To this the Apostle exhorts us with great earnestnesse and affection, *1 Cor. 1.10. Phil. 2.1.2.3. Eph. 3.4,5,6.* This the present times call for with a loud voice. And this shall be the care and praier of

Your unworthy servant

in the work of the Ministry,

EDMUND CALAMY.



also a corner stone to unite believers one to another.
 This is a great work, and will become not only our Reformer, but
 our Saviour. For he hath paid for all those that should
 believe in him. That they may be saved, as they have not in me.



This Edition will in due time be fulfilled, together with
 the former.

Errata.

Page 10. line 16. for privately reade privately. p. 14. l. 36. for uale. e
 quantum r. valeat quantum. p. 14. l. 24. for Poance r. France. p. 18. l. 5. for
 Carech/r. Doctrine of the Church, correct the like fault, p. 7. l. 10. p. 18. l. 37.
 put a middle point after these words Members for your part, p. 29. l. 5. blot
 one of the words or aliquid significat. p. 45. l. 24. for er. r. for. p. 50. l. 32. for m.
 sibly r. visible. p. 71. l. 5. blot our set. p. 73. l. 32. blot out these. p. 74. l. 11.
 is consistet r. consisteth. p. 87. l. 13. for xomduar r. xomduar r. p. 91. l. 4.
 for for a particular r. of a particular. p. 103. l. 34. for (?) let (.) p. 107. l. 18.
 for chaugh r. though. p. 127. l. 5. for it r. u. l. 16. for integrals r. integral. p. 136.
 l. 17. for a well r. a well. p. 144. l. 20. for to what r. in what. p. 163. l. 31.
 for presbyterio r. presbyterio. p. 168. l. 5. for no more it is. r. no more then it is.
 p. 176. l. 6. for passers r. passers. p. 191. l. 16. for and Israel r. in Israel. p. 194.
 l. 14. for distat r. distat. p. 201. l. 14. for good r. goods. p. 231. l. 1. for Christ
 r. Christian. p. 238. l. 13. for primally r. primarily. p. 266. l. 2. for folds r. fields.
 p. 262. l. 5. for two men r. two women.

THE END OF THE FIRST PART.



This Leaf being forgotten to be inserted in the former part of this
Thesis, it was thought fit, to adde it here.

M. Norton a reverend Minister in N. E. in his Treatise of the
Doctrine of Godlinesse, printed since his answer to Apollonius,
defineth the Church-Catholike to be the number of the elect
and redeemed, whom God hath called out of the world unto a
supernatural estate and communion of grace and glory with
himself in Jesus Christ. And affirms that there is but one Ca-
tholike Church, because there is but one faith. And then
comes to distinguish this Catholike Church in respect of its ad-
juncts into invisible and visible. And then defines a visible
Church to be a similar part of the Catholike Church, consisting
of a competent number, knit together by way of visible Cove-
nant, to exercise an holy communion with God in Christ, and
so one with another, according to the order of the Gospel.
And then distinguisheth this visible Church into pure and im-
pure; impure into 3. branches, viz. Simply erring, Schismatical,
Heretical. And then makes the matter of this visible
Church to be Saints, i. e. visible beleevers. From whence we
have these concessions. 1. That there is a Church-Catholike
which is but one. 2. That this Church-Catholike is visible, yea,
let me adde further out of his answer to Apollonius, *Politica
visibilitas est adjunctum respectu Ecclesie Catholicae*, pag. 87. i. e.
political visibility is an adjunct in respect of the Church-Catho-
like. 3. That this Church-Catholike is an integral. 4. That the
particular Churches are similar parts of that integral. 5. That
these particular Churches consist of visible beleevers, which as
himself in his answer to Apollonius, confesseth are not all
Saints in truth, *οὐ πάντες ἀληθεῖς*, but many of them only *κατὰ δόξαν*,
in appearance. 6. That some of these visible Churches may be
impure, not only simply erring, but schismatical, yea, here-
tical.

But (saving my honourable respect to so worthy a man) I
cannot see how these things are consistent with his definition
of the Church-Catholike: for how can the Church-Catholike
consist only of the elect redeemed ones, called out of the world
into a supernatural estate, and yet the particular Churches
*** which

which are similar (and constituent) parts of it, consist of members that are (many of them) only Saints in appearance, and not in truth; yet, some whole Churches erring, schismatical, heretical: ~~divided~~ ^{divided} ~~may~~ ^{may} as the particular visible Churches, which are the members of the Catholike consist of, such must the Church Catholike consist of, which is the similar integral. And though such as are only Saints in appearance, and not in truth, are said by Mr. Norton in his answer to Apollonius, p. 87. to be equivocal members of particular Churches, yet are they as truly members of the whole as they are of the parts, and they are so far true as that their external communion and administrations (if any such be Officers) are true and valid, both in respect of the particular Churches, and the Catholike, *quoad externam functionem*. And it is his own rule, *Resp.* p. 88. *Quicquid inest parti inest toti*, that which is in the part is in the whole. And again he saith *Ecclesia Catholica & Ecclesia particulares communicant essentia & nomine: & Ecclesia particulares, pro varijs earum rationibus habent se ut partes & ut adjuncta Ecclesie Catholicae. Ex natura, & ex ratione sunt ut res homogeneis, i.e. similes: ut mare appellatur aqua, ita & qualibet gutta maris appellatur aqua.* *Resp.* pag. 87. therefore they must needs consist of the same kinde of matter, as they are both visible.

2 JY 61

But (having my honorable respect to worthy a man) I cannot see how these things are consistent with his definition of the Church Catholike: for how can the Church Catholike consist only of the elect redeemed ones called out of the world into a heavenly state, and yet the particular Churches which



A TABLE

Of the chief things contained in this Tractate.

CHAPTER I.

The explication of the terms of the Question. Page I.

Section 1.



What is meant by Ecclesia or Church.

It is taken in a civil and theological sense.

In a theological sense :

- 1 *Primarily and properly for the whole company of the elect, which is called the Invisible Church.* 2
- 2 *For the company of visible beleevers.*
- 3 *For the members as distinct from the Officers of the Church.*
- 4 *For the Elders or governours of the Church as distinct from the body.* 3
- 5 *For the faithful in some one family.* 4

Section 2.

What is meant by visible.

The distinction of the visible and invisible Church opened.

The difference between visibile & visum.

The Churches mentioned in the N.T. were visible Churches. 6

An Objection of the absurdity of wicked mens being members of the body of Christ, answered by a distinction of Christs body.

The distinction of the Church into visible and invisible is not exact. 8

The invisible members of the Church are also visible.

What a Church visible is. 9

The description vindicated from some objections against it. 10

Section 3

The Table.

Section 3.

<i>What is meant by Catholike, universal, or oecumenical.</i>	11
<i>Four acceptations of the word Catholike, and which of them suit the question.</i>	
<i>What the universal visible Church is.</i>	12
<i>Diverse descriptions of it, and quotations out of Divines both ancient and modern about it.</i>	13
<i>What a National Church is.</i>	15
<i>Diverse proofs from Scripture for a National Church under the Gospel.</i>	
<i>The description of a particular visible Church given by Gersom Bucerus, scanned.</i>	17
<i>M^r Cottons description of a visible.</i>	18
<i>Four Queries about it propounded.</i>	
1. <i>Whether the matter of it consisteth only of Saints called out of the World?</i>	
2. <i>Whether every particular visible Church be a mystical body of Christ, or but only a part of it, seeing Christ hath but one mystical body, in the same sense?</i>	
3. <i>Whether the form of a particular visible Church be a particular Covenant?</i>	19
4. <i>Whether all the Ordinances of God can be enjoyed in a particular visible Church?</i>	20
<i>Which for some of them seemeth very inconvenienc.</i>	
<i>And for others impossible.</i>	
<i>M. Nortons description of a particular Church.</i>	22
<i>A Congregational Church standing alone, hardly found in the New Testament.</i>	

Section 4.

<i>What is meant by prima vel secundaria & orta.</i>	23
<i>The primity of the Church-Catholike in a threefold respect.</i>	24
<i>The difference between this question and M. Parkers.</i>	

Chapter. 1.

<i>Proofs by Scripture for a Church-Catholike visible.</i>	25
--	----

Section 1.

<i>Our Divines in answer to the Papiſts, mean by Church-Catholike the invisible Church only.</i>	26
--	----

The Table.

Yet is there also an external visible Kingdom of Christ, as well as an internal and invisible.

M. Hookers acknowledgement of a political body or Kingdom of Christ on earth.

D. Ames testimony of a Church-Catholike visible.

Section 2.

Diverse proofs out of the Old Testament for a Church-Catholike visible.

Section 3.

Diverse proofs out of the New Testament for a Church-Catholike visible.

Act. 8.3. and Gal. 1.13. vindicated.

Act. 2.47. vindicated.

1 Cor. 10.32. vindicated.

Gal. 4.26. opened.

Eph. 3.10. vindicated.

Section 4.

1 Cor. 12.28. vindicated.

Two answers of M. Hookers concerning this text considered.

Diverse answers to this text by M. Ellis, refuted.

An Objection of M. Hookers about Deacons set in the same Church where Apostles were set, answered.

Section 5.

1 Tim. 3.15. vindicated.

Diverse texts vindicated where the Church-Catholike is called the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of heaven,

M^r Hookers answer to those texts considered.

1 Cor. 15.33. vindicated.

Heb. 12.28. vindicated.

Section 6.

1 Cor. 5.12. vindicated.

Eph. 4.45. vindicated.

Mat. 16.18. vindicated.

M. Hookers acknowledgement that this text is meant of the visible Church.

3. Ep. of John ver. 10. vindicated.

The Table.

Chapter. 3.

Proofs by arguments and reason that there is a Church-Catholike visible. 64

Section 1.

- 1 From Gods donation unto Christ of an universal Kingdom.
- 2 From Gods intention in sending Christ, and the tenour of Gods exhibition of Christ in his word to the whole world. 65
- 3 From the general preaching and receiving of the Gospel. 66
- 4 From the general Charter whereby the Church is constituted.

Section 2.

- 5 From the generality of the Officers of the Church, and general donation of the Ministry. 67
- 6 From the general vocation wherewith, and general Covenant Whereinto all Christians are called. 68
- 7 From the generality of the initial seal, admittance and enrolment. 69
- 8 From the external catholike union between all visible Christians. 70

Section 3.

- 9 From the individual system or body of laws (proceeding from the same authority) whereby the whole is governed.
- 10 From the general, external communion, intercourse and communication between all Christians. 71
- 11 From the general extension of excommunication. 73
- 12 If there be parts of the Church-Catholike there is a whole.

Section 4.

Many metaphors in Scripture setting forth the whole Church under an unity. 74

Chapter. 4.

That the Church-Catholike visible is one Integral or Totum integrale.

Section 1.

First, Negatively, that it is not a Genus. 77

- 1 Because a Genus is drawn by mental abstraction of species, but the Catholike visible is made up by conjunction or apposition of the several members.
- 2 A Genus hath no existence of its own, which the Church-Catholike visible hath.

The Table.

- 3 It appears by the definition of a Genus, both according to the Ramists and Aristotelians, neither of which can agree to the Church-Catholike.

Section 2.

Secondly, Affirmatively, that it is an Integral. 79

- 1 Because it hath an existence of its own, which no Genus hath.
- 2 Because the particular Churches constitute the Oecumenical, which hath partes extra partes.
- 3 Because it is made up not only of particular Churches, but of particular beleevvers also.
- 4 Because it hath accidents and adjuncts of its own, existing in it.

80

It is capable of being greater or lesse.

It is mutable and fluxile.

81

It is measured by time and place.

Section 3.

- 5 Because it hath admission into it, nutrition and edification in it, and ejection out of it.
- 6 Because it hath a head and Governour of the same nature, as man, and Officers on earth, that are habitually indefinite Officers to the whole.
- 7 Because it hath actions and operations of the whole.
- 8 It appears by the several appellations given to it in the Scripture.
- 9 It appears by the Scripture-expressions of the union of the members of the whole Church.
- 10 Because the invisible Church may in some sense be called an integral, therefore much more the visible.

82

84

86

87

Section 4.

An Objection from the possible contraction of the Church-Catholike into narrow limits, answered.

Whether every essential predication will make the arguments to be Genus and Species.

89

Whether the right to the Ordinances and priviledges of the Church arise from the common nature and qualifications in beleevvers, or from a Covenant.

90

If from a Covenant, whether from a particular Covenant between man and man, or the general Covenant between God and man.

The Table.

<i>The variation of situation or accidents vary not the species.</i>	91
<i>The method of conveyance of the right of Church-priviledges asserted.</i>	94
<i>The particular Churches are similar parts and parcels of the Church-Catholike.</i>	95
<i>As the several Synagogues were of the Jewish Church.</i>	
<i>Meer cohabitation makes not a man a member of a Church.</i>	
<i>Yet for a visible beleever to inhabit within the limits of any particular Church, and not to be a member of it, impliyeth it either to be no Church, or a very corrupt one.</i>	96
<i>Chapter. 5.</i>	
<i>That the Church-Catholike is visible.</i>	97
<i>Section 1.</i>	
<i>There is an invisible company or Church of Christ.</i>	
<i>But that is not meant in this Question.</i>	
<i>Four distinctions of visible.</i>	98
<i>What kinde of visibility is here meant.</i>	
<i>Section 2.</i>	
<i>Arguments to prove the Church-Catholike to be visible.</i>	
<i>1 Because the matter thereof is visible.</i>	99
<i>2 Their conversion is visible.</i>	
<i>4 Because their profession, subjection, obedience and conversations are visible.</i>	100
<i>4 Because the Officers of the Whole Church are visible.</i>	101
<i>5 Because the admittance into, and ejection out of the Whole, are visible.</i>	102
<i>Section 3.</i>	
<i>6. Because the Doctrine, Laws, Ordinances, and Covenant of the whole are visible.</i>	
<i>An Objection of M. Hookers against this, answered.</i>	103
<i>7. Because all the administrations, dispensations, and operations of the Whole are visible.</i>	
<i>An Objection against this, answered.</i>	
<i>8. Because it is our duty to joyn our selves visibly thereto.</i>	104
<i>9. Because the accidents of the whole Church are visible.</i>	
<i>10. Because the several parts of the Whole Church are visible.</i>	105
<i>Section 4.</i>	
<i>Some Objections of M. Ellis answered.</i>	

The Table.

The Church-Catholike which our Divines in opposition to the Papists speak of, is not the same with this which is meant in this question. 107

Neither can that Church-Catholike be considered as a Genus, which this is affirmed by our brethren to be. 109

Section 5.

An Objection against the visibility of the Church-Catholike, because it wants an existence of its own; answered. 111

Another Objection from the necessity of the whole to meet together sometimes; answered. 113

Some exceptions of M. Ellis answered.

About general Councils and their power. 116

Section 6.

Another Objection from the necessity of a visible head of the Church-Catholike visible, answered. 117

How Christ may be said to be a visible head. 118

Some exceptions against Christs visible headship, answered. 119

Another Objection, viz. that the Church-Catholike is an article of our faith, and therefore cannot be visible, answered. 121

Chapter. 6.

That the Church-Catholike visible is an Organical, yet similar body. Yea, one Organical body. 123

Section 1.

That particular Churches are or ought to be organized.

Section 2.

That particular Churches thus organized are similar integral parts of the whole. 124

This assertion vindicated from M. Ellis's charge of a contradiction.

The similarity of the Churches asserted by D. Ames and M. Bartlet, &c. 125

It neither crosseth mine own scope, nor Apollonius, as is suggested. 126

Section 3.

The Church-Catholike is one Organical body. 127

The distinction of the Church into Entitive and Organical.

Whether the Church or the ministry be first. 128

The Table.

An explication how the Church-Catholike may be said to be one Organical body, and how not. 129

Section 4.

Arguments to prove the Church-Catholike one Organical body. 131

1. *From the metaphors whereby it is set out in Scripture. It is set out by a natural body.* 133
By a political body; as a Kingdom, City, Army.
By an Oeconomical body. 134
2. *Because a baptized person is admitted a member of the whole. Also because excommunication ejecteth out of the whole. Certificates indeed were sent from one Church to another to signify the inflicting of the censure, but no new act passed.*
3. *It appears by the Identity of the Covenant, Charter, Promises, and Laws of the whole.* 135
4. *By the general communion that all the members of the Church-Catholike have indefinitely with other members or Churches, whereever providence cast them.* 136
5. *From the opposition which the adversaries of the Church make against it as one organical body.* 137

Section 5.

6. *By the indefiniteness of the Office of Ministers. This Indefiniteness appears.*

1. *From the generality of the Donation, Institution and Commission of the Evangelical Ministry.* 138
They bear a double relation, one to the whole Church, another to the particular. 139
M. Rutherford, M. Balls Crakensborp, and Salmasius cited. 140

Section 6.

2. *From the subject matter whereabout their office is exercised, which is common to all.* 141
3. *From the end of the ministerial function, which cannot otherwise be attained.* 142
4. *From the actions which every Minister doth perform, by virtue of his office, indefinitely.* 143

Section 7.

5. *From the double relation which private members bear, one to whole, another to the particular Church.* 147

The Table.

6. From the great absurdities which otherwise will follow.	148
Section 8.	
Obj. Then ordinary Ministers differ nothing from Apostles and Evangelists, answered.	150
Chapter. 7.	
About Combinations of particular Congregations in Classes, and of them in Synods.	151
Section 1.	
A double integrality of the Church, First, Entitive. Secondly, Organical.	
A double combination, one habitual, another actual.	152
Section 2.	
The combining of particular Congregations into a Classis.	153
Scripture-proofs and Instances thereof.	154
Reasons to prove the necessity of it.	156
Section 3.	
Concerning Synods.	158
The authors that handle this subject,	
The nature, kinds, and authority of Synods.	159
Section 4.	
A threefold power of Synods, Dogmatical, Diatactical, Critical.	160
A ground of a Synod in Scripture, acknowledged by our Protestant Divines.	161
The Synod Act. 15. exerted all those three kinds of power.	162
Section 5.	
About the equality of power of single Congregations.	163
Their subordination to the combined.	164
This subordination is also a coordination.	
Scripture-proofs for this subordination.	
And reasons for it.	165
The like subordination found in the Jewish Church.	
And is dictated by light of nature, and common to all societies.	
Section 6.	
Divers Objections answered. As,	166
Obj. Then there must be 2. kinds of Presbyteries.	
Then every particular Minister hath a very transcendent power and authority.	167

The Table.

Then they are standing-Officers of the Christian World. 168
Then they are Christs Vicars general. 169

Section 7.

Then the Church of the whole world should choose every Officer. 170
Divers exceptions of M. Ellis's. 171

Section 8.

Then the Whole is to honour and contribute to the maintenance of every Minister. 173
Then the Ministers perform not their whole office to the Congregation that maintains them. 174
This will be too great a burthen for Ministers to meddle in the affairs of many Congregations.
Then Ministers exercise rule where they do not ordinarily preach, so the keys should not be commensurable. 175

Section 9.

This was a grand objection formerly against the Bishops, that they ruled where they preached not. 176
Then great and stubborn persons will never be brought to censure.
This will occasion much trouble and charge to the parties grieved.
Synods are in danger of erring as well as particular memberships. 177

Section 10.

The liberty of appeals proved.
But why then should Christ let his Church want general Councils so long. 178
But how then dare particular Churches abrogate the decrees of general Councils. 179

Chapter 8.

An answer to M. Ellis's Prejudices, Probabilities, and Demonstrations against an universal, visible (and as he calls it) governing (but should have said organical) Church. And his wrong stating of the Question rectified. 180

Section 1.

What M. Ellis denyeteth to be the question.
1. He saith it is not meant of the essential oneness.
Ans. But this is meant, and is the foundation of the other.

The Table.

2 It is not (saith he) means of engagement to mutual care one of another. 182

Ans. Not amicitial or fraternal only, but authoritative, the greater part to regulate the less.

3 Nor is it meant (saith he) of a voluntary association, as occasion requires for mutual assistance.

Ans. Their association, though it be necessary, yet it is voluntary, but not arbitrary.

4 Nor is it meant (saith he) whether all or most Churches may occasionally become one by messenger, in a general Councel. 183

Ans. This is the highest effect this unity produceth.

Section 2.

What M. Ellis grants in this question.

1 An authoritative power from Christ to make directions and rules, to which the conscience is bound to submit, and which are to be obeyed, not only because materially good, but because formally theirs.

Ans. This is even as much as the Presbyterians desire.

But this he denies to be done by Church-Officers, as Officers. 184

2 If the universal Church were convenient, he grants what is contended for.

Ans. The parts may rule themselves (being similar) as well as the whole the whole. 185

Section 3.

M. Ellis's corrupt stating of the question in divers places. 186

Apollonius and the London-Ministers vindicated. 187

The particular Churches act not by commission from the general. 188

The whole company of Christians on earth are not in their ordinary settled Church-constitution, one single actual Corporation, but habitual. 189

Yet there may be causes to draw the Officers of many Congregations together, yea, haply some Officers from the whole Church, if it could be, occasionally. 190

The Ministers are not actually Ministers of the whole Church, but habitually.

They are given to the whole Church, as the Levites to the whole house of Israel. 191

The Table.

Section 4.

Answers to M. Ellis's prejudices, probabilities and demonstrations. 191

His Objection of novelty, answered.

That the Church is one habitually, and that the particular Churches bear the relation of members to it, is not novel.

That the Ministers are Ministers beyond their own Congregations, and can perform duties authoritatively, is not novel.

Divers instances given thereof out of Scripture.

Divers Canons regulate Ministers in the exercise of their functions abroad, but none deny them power. 193

Divers instances out of antiquity. 194

Frequent conventions of Synods and Councils anciently, and their acting authoritatively. 196

Five answers of M. Ellis's heretunto, considered of. 197

Section 5.

M. Ellis's Witnesses against the unity and integrality of the Church considered, viz. Chrysostome, Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyprian, Augustine, Eucherius, and the Council of Trent. 198

That it is not novel in respect of Protestant Divines. 201

Some quotations out of Calvin, &c. 202

Section 6.

M. Ellis's prejudice from the dangerous consequences of this opinion, answered. 203

Section 7.

Another prejudice that it is Papal and Antiprottestant, answered. 205

Section 8.

M. Ellis's arguments answered. 206

His first argument from the silence of the Scripture herein.

1 *From the institution of Christ.* 207

2 *From the first execution of the greatest act of intire power exercised in a particular Congregation, 1 Cor. 5.* 208

3 *Because intire power was committed to particular men, viz. the Apostles severally, and to all jointly.*

4 *From the reproofs given by Christ to the 7. Churches of Asia, in the Revelation.*

Section

The Table.

Section 9.

His second sort of arguments from the matter and members of the Church, answered. 209

Section 10.

A third sort of arguments is from the form and nature of all bodies and corporations, which consist of superiour and inferiour, answered. 210

Six pretended inconveniences, answered. 211

Section 11.

A fourth sort of arguments from the authors of this opinion, answered. 212

An objection That the whole world is one humane society, and yet this makes them not one Kingdom politically, answered. 213

The second Question.

Whether the Church-Catholike visible, or the particular Churches be first.

Section 1.

What kinde of priority is meant here. 216

First, Negatively, not a priority of time.

2 Not in regard of constitution by aggregation and combination.

3 Not in regard of ordinary operation.

But positively, the visible Church-Catholike is prime.

1 In Gods intention. 217

2 In regard of Gods institution.

3 In regard of Gods donation of Ordinances and priviledges.

4 In regard of dignity.

5 In regard of perfection.

6 In regard of the essence or entitivenesse.

7 In regard of efficient ministerial causality. 218

8 In regard of distinct and perfect knowledge or noscibility.

The difference between ortum and secundarium.

Section 2.

The first argument for the priority of the visible Church-Catholike from the names that are given to the Church in Scripture. 219

The Table.

The second argument is because the Covenant, Promises, Laws and Priviledges primarily belong to the Catholike Church.

The Covenant, commission for gathering the Evangelical Church, the promises made to it, and Laws of it, proved to be universal.

220

The Priviledges are also catholike.

First, Federal holinesse is a priviledge of the Catholike Church.

221

Secondly, Right to the Ordinances of Christ.

222

Proved in regard of Baptism.

223

And the Lords Supper.

224

Hearing of the Word, and joyning in Praier.

225

The query about the Ordinances of Discipline discussed.

226

1 Every member of the Church (though but entitive) is bound to submit thereto.

2 Every Minister hath an habitual indefinite power annexed to his office to administer them.

3 The Ordinances of discipline were first given to general Pastors.

227

4 The censures dispensed have influence into the Whole Church.

5 Otherwise great inconvenience will follow.

6 All polities administer justice to strangers offending within their limits.

And the like power must be allowed to Ecclesiastical polities.

Section 3.

The third argument is because Christs Offices are first intended for, and executed on the Church-Catholike.

228

The fourth argument is because the signs to difference the true Church from a false, belong primarily to the Whole.

229

The fifth argument is because all the members are members of the Church-Catholike primarily.

230

Both those that are born members, and those converted.

This illustrated by three similitudes.

231

Section 4.

The sixth argument is because the Ministers are primarily Ministers of the Church-Catholike.

232

Diverse proofs hereof.

The absurd consequences of binding the Ministers office to his particular

The Table.

<i>ricular Congregation only.</i>	233
<i>The Ministers office and power ceaseth not by the dissolution of his particular flock,</i>	235
<i>An Objection against this by M.A. and M.S. taken from the ceasing of the ruling Elder or Deacons office, at such dissolution, answered.</i>	236
<i>It appears because the censure of excommunication inflicted by particular Officers, reacheth the Whole Church-visible.</i>	237
<i>The distinctions of formally and virtually, and of antecedenter & consequenter, discussed.</i>	238
<i>It appears also because particular Officers admit into the Church-Catholike by baptism.</i>	239
<i>Baptizing is an act of the ministerial office.</i>	
<i>All are baptized into one body.</i>	
<i>Many examples of persons baptized without relation to any particular Congregations.</i>	
<i>Though it be objected that this was done by extraordinary Officers, yet this salves it not, because if it be an Ordinance belonging to particular, congregational members, these being not so, they could have no right to receive it, no jus in re.</i>	240
<i>Some are called Ministers in Scripture in regard of more Congregations then one.</i>	241
<i>And ruled in common over more Congregations then one.</i>	

Section 5.

<i>The seventh argument is, because every Christian bears his first relation to the Church Catholike, and that relation continueth last, and cannot be broken off without sin.</i>	242
<i>Hence strangers tried where they reside for the present.</i>	
<i>Ephesus commended for trying strangers. Rev, 2. 2.</i>	
<i>Non communion is a sentence denounced against strangers.</i>	
<i>Hereticks and false teachers not fixed, must not be suffered.</i>	
<i>It is no sin to remove from one Congregation to another.</i>	243
<i>The eighth argument is, because particular Churches spring from the Church-Catholike, and are an additament thereto.</i>	244
<i>The Church-Catholike is as the main Ocean, and the particular as the arms thereof.</i>	
<i>A double rise of particular Churches out of the Catholike.</i>	245

The Table.

First, They are made up of members of the Church-Catholike, i. e. of visible beleivers.

Secondly, They finde the Church-Catholike constituted and invested before their addition.

1 The Church-Catholike is instrumental to their conversion.

2 And gives them ministerially their admittance, both into the Church entitive and organical.

Section 6.

What is sufficient in foro externo to make a man a member of the Church-Catholike visible. 246

The absurdities of accounting true beleivers only members of the visible Church.

Apollonius and Mr Norton cited.

Obj. Holinesse of dedication is founded on holiness of sanctification, answered. 247

Instances out of the Old and New Testament for the contrary.

Personal and Ecclesiastical judgement differ. 248

The rules of the invisible Church serve not for the visible.

There are the same qualifications for the members of the Church-Catholike visible, as for the particular Churches. 249

Two Objections against the priority of the Church-Catholike, answered. 250

The conclusion of the premises. 253

Section 7.

Corollaries from the former Thesis. 254

24 Corollaries concerning the Church-Catholike.

12 Concerning particular Churches. 255

7 Concerning the publike Officers of the Church. 256

12 Concerning private members. 257

Section 8.

An application of the Thesis bewailing our division. 258

First, in judgement.

Diverse errors reckoned up that are broached.

Secondly, in heart and affections.

Thirdly, in way or practice.

An exhortation to unity in all these 3. respects. 262



THE
ESSENCE AND VNITY
OF THE
Church Catholike visible, &c.

QUEST.

Utrum Ecclesia visibilis universalis siue Oecumenica sit prima, vel secundaria & orta a particularibus?

Whether the vis. Ch. Cath. or the particular Churches be first?

CHAPTER I.

The Explication of the Terms.



OR the handling of this Question, here are these four terms to be opened. First, What is meant by *Ecclesia*, or *Church*? Secondly, What by *visibilis*, or *visible*? Thirdly, What is meant by *universalis*, *siue oecumenica*, or *universal and oecumenical*? Fourthly, What by *prima* and *orta*, or the first Church, and that which riseth of it or secondary?

1. First, What a Church is? The word *Church* is taken in a civil or theological sense. In a civil sense, for a company of people summon'd, or gathered together for some civil affairs, *Acts* 19.39. *It shall be determined in a lawfull assembly*; the word in the Original is *ἐκκλησία*, a Church. Yea even the rout met together, *Acts* 19.41. is called *Ecclesia*, ἀπέλυσε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, He dismissed the assembly; or the *Church*, as the word is in the Original.

Secondly, In a theological sense, it signifieth a company of people that are called, or to be called and joyned together, standing in some spiritual relation to God. And so the word is taken diversly

First

SECT. I.

First and most properly, for the whole company of the elect, as they are opposed to the reprobates, whether Jew or Gentile: and in this sense it is taken Ephes. 5. 25, 26. *As Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it, that he might cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word.* So vers. 23, 27. and 32. Again Col. 1. 18. *His body the Church.*

Interdum eam Ecclesiam nominant, eam intelligunt qua revera est coram Deo, in quam nulli recipiantur nisi & adoptionis gratia filij Dei sunt, & spiritali sanctificatione vera Christi membra. Ac tunc quidem non tantum sanctos qui in terra habitant comprehendit, sed electos omnes qui ab origine mundi fuerunt. Calvin Instit. lib. 4. cap. 1. sect. 7. where you may see more of this subject. Of these there are three sorts: The first are *elect* *uncalled*, which are not actually the Church, but *in potentia*, and in Gods decree: the second sort are *militant*, warring with principalities and powers, with flesh, world, and devil, being actually justified and sanctified persons; the third sort are *triumphant* in Heaven, having finished their course, and are now *the spirits of just men made perfect*: For the fourth, which the Papists make, *viz. Ecclesia dormiens*, in Purgatory, we acknowledge not.

Secondly, The word *Church* sometimes signifyeth more then the elect, *viz. the multitude of believers whether truly or in shew only.* So Act. 8. 3. *Saul made havock of the Church.* Act. 12. 1. *Herod stretched out his hands to vex certain of the Church.* Now it is certain that neither Herod nor Saul knew who were elect; but as himself expounded it, *He persecuted this way unto the death. And he desired letters to Damascus, that if he found any of that way, he might binde them.* Act. 9. 2. So Act. 5. 11. *Fear came upon all the Church.* Now it cannot be conceived that they were all elect that feared that judgement of God. So 1 Tim. 5. 16. *Let not the Church be charged with them, that it may relieve widows indeed.* Now we cannot conceive that only the elect gave collection, but the whole number of professors, which yet are called the Church, *In Ecclesia plurimi sunt permixti hypocritae, qui nihil Christi habent, prater titulum & speciem.* Calvin Instit. lib. 4. cap. 1. sect. 7.

Thirdly, The word *Church* is sometimes taken for the members

bers of the Church, as distinct from the officers, *Act. 15. 22.* Sect. 1. Then pleased it the Apostles and Elders with the whole Church, And *ver. 4.* They were received of the Church, and of the Apostles and Elders. And this was before their convention in the Synod. And *Act. 14. 23.*

Fourthly, The word *Church* sometimes signifyeth the Governours of the Church, to whom of right it belongeth to administer and dispense the censures of the Church. *Mat. 18. 17.* If he will not hear them, tell it to the Church, i. e. the Ministerial Church, where Christ seemeth to me to speak of a Church that was in present being among the Jews, because he applies his speech to the capacity of the Jews present, *Let him be to thee as an heathen and Publican*, who might not have communion with Heathens, and would not with Publicans, but Christians might eat and drink with both: and the same course by analogy was to be taken by Christians when they had Churches set up, as it followeth, *ver. 18, 19. Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, &c.*

Now we know that matters of complaint were not among the Jews brought unto the Assembly or body of the people, but to their Elders and Rulers. And the word *Kahal*, which signifieth *Ecclesia* or *Church*, is frequently used in the Old Testament for a Court of Elders, not only Ecclesiastical, but even civil. See *1 Chron. 13. 1, 2, 4.* And *1 Chron. 29. 1, 10, 20.* And *2 Chron. 29. 28, 31, 32.* And *2 Chron. 30. 2, 4.* called *Psalm 82. 1.* The Congregation of the Gods. Compare also *Num. 35. 12, 24, 25.* and *Deut. 19. 12.* with *Isa. 20. 4, 6.* By Congregation in one place is expounded Elders in the other. Also *Exod. 12. 3.* with *v. 21.* *Deut. 31. 28.* *וְיָקֻם יְהוָה אֶתְּיָדָיו וְיַגְמִשׁוּ אֶתְּיָדָיו* gather me the Elders, or make a Church of Elders. The same word we finde *1 Kin. 8. 1.* of *Solomons* assembling the Elders of Israel. And *1 Chr. 28. 1.* of *Dauids* assembling the Elders. The Septuagint translate *Kahal Ecclesia* or *Church*, by *ἐκκλησία* *Prov. 26. 26.* His wickedness shall be shewed before the whole Congregation, i. e. *ovvδίστω*. Compare also *Deut. 23. 1, 2, 3, 8.* No bastard, Ammonite, Moabite, &c. might enter into *Kahal*, the Congregation, which is rendred by the best Divines to be *Conseffus Iudicum*, the Congregation of Judges. For by *Exa. 12. 48, 49.* and *Num. 15. 14, 15.* and *9. 14.* and *Lev. 24. 18.* All strangers upon circumcision were

Chap. 1. admitted into the Congregation of the people to offer to God as well as Israelites. *Demostrans* useth the word *conscientia magnanimum*, saith Pastor. It is very frequent in the Scripture to speak of executing of judgement and justice, and putting away of evil from the Congregation, indefinitely by *ye* and *thou*, as if it were spoken to the whole Congregation, which was done by the Elders and Judges only, judicially: *Levit* 19. 15, 35. *Deut.* 16. 19. *Ier.* 7. 5. *Amos* 5. 15, 24. *Zach.* 7. 9, 16. *1 Cor.* 5. 4, 7, 12.

Fifthly, The word *Church* is sometimes used to signify the faithful in some one family, *Philom.* 1. Sec. *To the Church in thy house*, Unless those families were the meeting places for the Christians that dwelt about, to enjoy the Ordinances of God in, because there were no public meeting-houses built. And to this I confesse I incline. The second acceptation of the word *Church* staves best with this question.

Seet. 2.

The second term to be opened is, what is meant by *Visible*? The Church is distinguished into *visible* and *invisible*, which yet are not two distinct Churches or species of Churches, but it is a distribution of the Subject by the Adjunct, *viz.* *in duplici modo communionis, externae et internae*. Such as have spiritual communion with Christ, *viz.* inwardly, are said to be *invisible* members, which are only known to God, and not to men, having this seal, *The Lord knoweth who are his*. Such as have external communion in outward Ordinances *viz.*, they are called *visible* members, because their communion is visible and apparent. I grant the *internal* communion is *invisible*, but the *external* is as *visible* as of any civil society: and Gods Ordinances are as visibly administered, as justice at the Sessions or Assizes, and the profession of Christianity is as visible as the profession of any trade: the general calling to be Christians by profession, is as visible as the particular calling and trade of life. The inward grace is indeed *invisible*, but the outward administration of the Ordinances, and communion in them, is visible, *viz.* perceptible by the senses. And this external communion in the Ordinances, though it were distributively in the several places where men live (which is confessed by all) would serve my turn for this question which I have in hand. But *visible* taken in the sense which

M. Ellis takes it in, in his *Indicia Catholica*, for that which Sect. 2. *Uno intuitu videtur*, is seen with one view, was not my meaning, and therefore to expound it so, which he knows I did not, is to prevaricate, as he chargeth me, pag. 59. If *visible*, i.e. that which may be seen, and *visum*, that which is seen actually, be the same, then is not the world visible. But when we say the whole world is visible, there is required an act of the minde: we conceive that all countries are visible as well as our own; and if we were there we might see them. They cannot be said to be invisible, because we see them not actually. *Nam visibile est quod videri potest, licet nunquam videtur. Visible is that which may be seen, though it be never actually seen. Videri potest, or may be seen*, is referred to the capability of the object to be seen, not to the particular act of every agent at all times. But take visible in his sense, *Quod uno intuitu videri potest*, as a Kingdom representative in a Parliament.

Is a Parliament only visible to such as do actually see it, and invisible to all others? Is it not *visible* because not *visum*? Men know it may be seen, though they see it not; though they exercise their knowledge only about it, and not their senses, yet that makes it not a *genus* or *secunda notio*: It is visible, though not actually seen. *Cameron de Ecclesie conspicuitate*, pag. 245. faith, the Church is visible as the world is: we cannot see the whole world together, but *secundum partes, successive, non uno intuitu*: *attamen nulla est pars terra habitabilis qua non possit cerni*.

Now only the invisible company have internal spiritual communion, and are elect: many of those that have external communion and are visible members, shall perish. And yet by reason of their profession are said 2 *Thef.* 1. 1. to be in God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, as Ames also confesseth, *Ames. med. lib. 1. cap. 32. art. 9.* Such was the Church of Corinth and Ephesus, &c. wherein all were not in communion for life. And of such Christ speaketh *Ioh.* 15. 2. *Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he takes away. And vers. 6. If a man abides not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered, and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.* These are said to be redeemed, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. denying the Lord that bought them. And sanctified, *Heb.* 10. 29. *And hath accounted the blood*

Chap. 1.

of the Covenant wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing. And in Pauls exordiums to his Epistles, *To the Church of God, to them that are sanctified in Christ Iesus, called to be Saints*, 1 Cor. 1.2. These are called the *sonnes of God*, Gen. 6. 2. And Deut. 14.1. It is spoken of Israel in general, *ye are the children of the Lord your God*. And Gal. 3.26. *Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Iesus*. Now it is not to be conceived that all the members of the Churches in Galatia were true beleevers. They are called *the children of the Kingdom*, Mat. 8.12. i.e. reputed so, but yet many of them were cast out into utter darknesse. And Act. 3.25. *Ye are the children of the Covenant which God made with our fathers*.

Their advantage by being of the visible body was great every manner of way, Rom. 3.1,2. To them pertained the adoption, Rom.9.4. and the glory, and the Covenant, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the promises. Which adoption is not internal adoption (proper only to true beleevers) for it is a privilege belonging to the body of that people; but it is the honour of being separated and reputed the children of God, and so to live under the external Covenant and service of God, and promises, though they had not grace to improve them. They are called Ro. 11.17. *branches of the true olive*, partaking of the root and fatnesse of the Olive, which were broken off, and others ingrafted in their room, which cannot be meant of the invisible company of elect, but the visible Church. God did not blot some out of his book of election, and put others in; or break off any true beleevers, and graff others in, but only out of their visible Church, standing, and partaking in outward Ordinances.

Object. But is not this absurd that Christ should have wicked men, who are limbs of Satan, to be of his mystical body? Carnal wicked men to be members of such a gracious, glorious head?

Ans. If by mystical body be meant the company of elect, faithful ones, that are knit to Christ by the Spirit on his part, and by faith on their part, and receive spiritual sap and vertue, and grace from Christ internally; it were altogether absurd to suppose any limb of Satan were so: but mystical body is taken in opposition to a natural and civil body. Now draw a word

(as suppose head) from its *natural* and *proper* signification to Sect. 2. a civil use, and head will signifie a King, who is called a civil head, and then draw it to a *theological* use, and it is called a mystical use of that word, and so Christ is called a spiritual or mystical head, and the Church a mystical body. And in this sense mystical and organical are competible, for both visible and invisible members may be said to be of the mystical body of Christ, though in a different respect in regard of their communion, the one visibly only, the other not only visibly but also invisibly. And in this sense M. Cotton in his Catechism calls a particular Church a mystical body of Christ, wherein all are not of the invisible company. And as the body admits of such a distinction, so doth the head also, for Christ affordeth spiritual communion to some inwardly, as well as outwardly by Ordinances, even saving graces and comforts by the Spirit of grace; to others only outwardly by Ordinances, and by common works of his Spirit. In the same sense that a visible Church may be called a mystical body of Christ, Christ may also be called a mystical head thereof. As Christ terms himself a Master, so he hath evil, slothful, unfaithful servants and stewards: as a King, he hath rebels that will not have him to rule over them, even in his Church, *Mat. 25. 26. Luk. 19. 14.* as a shepherd he hath goats as well as sheep: *Mat. 25. 31.* as a householder he hath vessels of dishonour as well as honour, *2 Tim. 2. 20. Mat. 25. 2.* as a bridegroom he hath foolish virgins as well as wise invited to the wedding: as a husbandman, he hath tares among his wheat, *Matth. 13. 25.* as a fisherman, he hath rubbish in his net as well as good fish *Mat. 13. 47.* as a vine, he hath unfruitful branches as well as fruitful, *Joh 15. 6.* Christ saith, my people are foolish, they have not known me, sottish children that have no understanding, that are wise to do evil, but to do good they have no knowledge, *Jer. 4. 22.* yea, stubborn and rebellious people. In the N.T. there were some in the Church of Corinth, *1 Cor. 11.* that had *not the knowledge of God, denying the resurrection, guilty of drunkenness at the Lords table, guilty of fornication and uncleanness, and lasciviousness, and had not repented.* And *1st. 1. 16.* Paul speaks of some in the Church, that *professed they knew God, but in works denied him, being abominable,*

Chap. 1.

disobedience, and to every good work reprobate. And 2 Tim. 3. 5. Having a form of godliness, and denying the power thereof. And Phil. 3. 18, 19. Enemies to the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things. See what manner of persons Iude speaks of in 12, 13, and 16. verses. Spots in their seats of charity, feeding themselves without fear, clouds without water, carried about with winds, trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots, raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame, wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blacknesse of darkness for ever: murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts, &c. Yet these were Gods people by dedication and consecration, and God owneth them so. And is it not as absurd for Christ to have such branches as such members?

But though the Metaphor taken from the natural head and members, seem to imply such a strict union and communion as to set forth only the elect, yet we know that many of them are not called, and so in their natural condition as vile as any, and even the best on earth are but sinful men; yet as it is borrowed from a civil head and political body, it is no absurdity at all. For God himself is head and Governour of all the world, and thereby of devils as well as angels, beasts as well as men, wicked men as well as good, for he is the sovereign ruler over all. And Christ Eph. 1. 22, is said to be head over all things to the Church his body. There is therefore a visible Ecclesiastical body, which may also in some sense be called mystical: and there is also an invisible spiritual body of the elect only, which is most properly called mystical. There are two sieves or garbles which God useth, the first is, to sift the world into a visible Ecclesiastical body, over which Christ is a mystical, political, governing head and ruler, and this sieve is managed by the hands of the Ministers; the second is to sift the visible Ecclesiastical body into a spiritual invisible body; and that is in Gods hand only.

Now we are to know that this distinction of *visible* and *invisible* is a very lame one, and the lameness thereof deceiveth many: For whereas all distributions should have their parts distinct and different, and the more opposite the members be, the better

better the distribution is; these two branches of this distinction Sect. 2. interfier one with another, and the one comprehends the other: the visible comprehend the invisible here in this world, I mean, the persons though not the notions. For though indeed every visible member is not invisible, yet every invisible member in the Church is also visible. *Ad Catholicam Ecclesiam visibilem in terris se recipere debent, quotquot invisibiles illam cives esse cupiunt.* Polani Syntag. l. 7. c. 9. *Invisibilis Ecclesia latet in Ecclesia visibilis ut pars in toto, si utramque consideres ut certum vocatorum externa vocatione, quae communis est invisibili & visibili Ecclesiae.* Ibid.

They that have inward communion with Christ for life, are not taught and nourished only by an inward unction or inspiration, but are fain to have external communion also in the outward Ordinances of God. *De Ecclesia vivorum modo agitur, cui Symbolum Apostolicum prescriptum est, non de caelesti.* Ram. in Symb. So that this distinction is like the old distinction of *Gratia gratis data, & gratia gratum faciens*, whereas *Omnis gratia gratum faciens, est etiam gratia gratis data.*

If invisible had been taken for Saints in heaven, and visible for Saints on earth, it had been a compleat distinction. Or if visible had been taken for a Church conspicuous, flourishing with liberty of Ordinances; and invisible for a Church latent, as under persecutions, and general heresies, then it had been compleat; but the terms are not used in either of those senses, and therefore the distinction halts. So that in what is to be said we must take heed that by visible we mean not only such as are hypocrites and reprobates, but those that are also truly godly; not only such as make external profession of faith, whereby they are differenced from heathens, but such as have inward sincerity also, whereby they are differenced from hypocrites.

The Church visible (I said) is a company of people called or separated by God from idols to the true religion, and professing professed subjection to this call, which is true of the godly as well as of the hypocrites. This description is excepted against by some, because it is said to be a separation from idols, whereas many athiests and Jews, who worship no idols, may be converted,

What a Church visible is.

Chap. 1.

verted, and therefore (say they) it had better have been said, called out of the world. But I answer, that that expression would have admitted of as much exception, for there is much of the World in the Church. *I pray not for the world*, saith Christ, *Ioh. 17. 9.* which was meant of the reprobate Jews, which yet were in the visible Church. If I had made a description of the invisible Church, it had been right to have said called out of the world, but speaking of the visible Church, Idols are the most proper contradicting term to the living God, and Idolatry that which onely causeth a divorce between God and a visible Church; and obstinate prophaneness, which is opposite to the *professed subjection*, mentioned in the description. And though some converted should have been Jews or Athiests, &c. that never were Idolaters, yet my description takes them in, for I mean a separation or call both *privatively* and *negatively*, *privatively*, if they have been Idolaters, *negatively*, though they never were, *i.e.* there must be a disclaiming of Idols *negatively*, though there never were a positive worshipping of them. As if a neuter who never struck in of any side, shall side with one opposite, there must be a disclaiming of the other opposite.

An Objection much to this purpose, reverend M. Norton hath, *In Respons. ad totam Quaestionum Syllogem. p. 115.* whereby he would inferre, That a Synod is not a Church; his words are these, *Nulius cernit cuius membrorum vocatio non habet mundum terminum immediatum a quo, & Christum terminum immediatum ad quem, habet sancte vocatus pro proxima materia. At omnis Synodus est talis cernit cuius membrorum vocatio non habet terminum immediatum a quo, &c. Materia Synodi sunt pij & docti viri, membra Ecclesie.* But with due respect unto him, I conceive, he little considered how much this argument strikes at all the Churches in *New-England*, which are made up of members, not immediately called out of the world, but of members of our Churches in *Old England*, and by Gods Ministers here converted, and sealed with the seal of the Covenant.

A second exception against it is, Because a Church may be a Church, though they fall to some Idolatry, as the ten Tribes were

were owned by God as his people though Idolaters.

Scet. 3.

I answer, there were 7000. in *Israel* in the worst times, that lived *latent* among the Idolaters, who never bowed the knee to Baal, nor kissed him, and God might own the people for their sakes, being the better part, though the lesse. Secondly, though God doth not divorce a Church for all Idolatry, yet they deserve it. And at last came forth the sentence of *Lo-ammi* and *Lo-ruhamah* against the ten Tribes for it, *Hos. 1.6.9.* Thirdly, I answer, it may be *vere Ecclesia* (as is said of the Church of Rome by some) but not *vera & pura*: and it was needful for me, as near as I could, to give a description of a true Church. But I will not contend with any about this description, you may take a more comprehensive description. A visible Church may be described to be a company of those that own or do professe the doctrine of Christ. Or such as professe the true Religion.

Scet. 3.

The third term to be opened is, *Catholike, universal or Oecumenical*. The word *Catholike* is frequently given to such Churches as hold the true doctrine of the Apostles, and in that sense it is the same with Apostolical, as it is opposed to heretical, and so we finde it frequently used in *Eusebius, Socrates* and *Sozomen*. So *Damasus* is called Bishop of the Catholike Church at Rome, and *Anoulinus* of the Catholike Church at Carthage, and *Callinicus* of the Catholike Church at Pelenusium. And the Council of Nice calls the Bishops of the Orthodox Churches, Bishops of the Catholike and Apostolical Church. And in that sense I suppose *M. Ellis* intends it in the title of his book which he calls *Vindicia Catholica*, a sound or Orthodox vindication. For if he means by it A general vindication against all that assert a Church-Catholike visible, he is mistaken therein also; for *M. Rutherford* hath written professedly of my question in both the branches of it, that there is a Church-Catholike visible, and that it is the prime Church: though I confesse I knew not of it when I printed my *Thesis*. But this signification doth not fully comprehend my meaning of the word. Secondly, *Catholike* is taken for an office in the Church, next under a Patriarch, that was as his Vicar general, and is called in Latine *Rationalis*: See *Salmas. de primat. Pap. p. 212.* Thirdly, *Catholike, universal or general* is taken for a logical second notion, abstracted by

Chap. 1. the minde of man comprehending divers different *species* under it. Fourthly, It is taken in the same sense that we use to take *Oecumenical*, that which is or may be all over the world. The first and last sense are only pertinent to this Question, *viz.* the Orthodox Church over all the earth, and especially this latter, and therefore now I have inserted the word *Oecumenical* into the question.

And in both these senses *Augustine* takes it, who saith, the Church is called Catholike, *Quia universaliter perfecta est, & in nullo claudicat, & per totum orbem diffusa est.* Aug. de Gen. ad lit. cap. 1.

We are to know that the Church of God admits of several distinctions from several accidents. As in reference to the *times* wherein the Church hath existed, or doth exist, it is distributed into the Church under the *Old Testament*, and the Church under the *New*; And this again is distributed into the *primitive* and *successive*: So in regard of the places where the Church doth exist, or persons of whom it consisteth, it receiveth the distinction of *universal* and *particular*. Now in this question, universal is meant principally in regard of *persons* and *places*, and not in regard of time. *The Church Catholike existing on earth at the same time, is compared with particular Churches existing at the same time also.*

What the universal visible Church is.

The Universal visible Church, is the whole company of visible believers throughout the whole world. Now whereas *M. Ellis* vind. p. 52. saith, this definition of the Church Catholike reacheth not the subject of my question, but contains what is of all hands confessed. I answer, I aimed at no more in the first part of my question, but to prove that there is a Church Catholike visible, which he saith is of all hands confessed, and then I have as much as I desired, namely, the subject of my question granted. But I will further adde that which *M. Ellis* thinketh wanting to make it pertinent to this question, *viz.* *That this company is one visible Kingdom of Christ on earth.* The Evangelical Church, which is so often called by Christ, the Kingdom of heaven, several men give several descriptions thereof. I shall set down some of their sentences.

" Ecclesia Dei vivi est columna & firmamentum veritatis, Sect. 3.
 " toto orbe terrarum diffusa, propter Evangelium quod predica-
 " tur, sicut dicit Apostolus, in omni creatura que sub celo est.

Aug.

" Sancta Ecclesia nos sumus, sed non sic dico nos, quasi ecce qui
 " hic sumus, qui me modo auditis, sed quosquos sunt Christiani fi-
 " deles in universo terrarum orbe, quoniam a solis ortu usq; ad occa-
 " sum laudatur nomen Domini. Sic se habet Ecclesia Catholica
 " mater nostra, Aug. Serm. 99. Adhuc habet Ecclesia quo crescat
 " donec illud impleatur, Dominabitur a mari usq; ad mare. Aug. in
 Matth.

" Diffeminata est Ecclesia super omnem terram. Iren. lib. 3.
 cap. 11.

" Non altera Romana urbis Ecclesia, altera totius orbis
 " estimanda, Gallia & Bithinia, & Persis, & Oriens, &
 " India, & omnes barbara gentes, nationes, unum Christum
 " adorant, unam observant regulam veritatis. Si autho-
 " ritas queritur, Orbis major est urbe. Jerom. ad Evan-
 " dr.

" Distincti per Orbem Ecclesiarum conventus, unam Catholicam
 " faciunt Ecclesiam. Beda in 1 Pet. 2.

" Catholica Ecclesia est illa qua diffusa est per universum orbem.
 " Cyril. Hierosol. Catech. 18.

" Quum unus sis Deus, una fides, unus Dei & hominum me-
 " diator Iesus Christus, unicum Ecclesia caput, consequitur
 " necessario unam quoq; esse Ecclesiam. Beza conf. fid. cap. 5.
 " art. 2.

" Sape Ecclesia nomine universam hominum multitudinem in
 " orbe diffusam designamus, que unum se Deum & Christum co-
 " lere profitetur. Calv. Instit. l. 4. c. 1. s. 7.

" Est Congregatio omnium per orbem universum qui consenti-
 " fide Evangelica. Bulling.

" Est ceteris hominum Christus, suum regem, sacerdotem, &
 " prophetam profitentium. Keckerm.

" In novo Testamento, vocamus Ecclesiam pro omnibus qui
 " Christo nomen dederunt. Zuingl.

" Univerſa multitudo Christianorum que se fidelem censet, simul
 " unum fidelis populus, una Ecclesia dicitur. Idem.

Chap. I.

" *Ecclesia significat totam illam omnium multitudinem*
 " *qua generatim ex vocatione, & professione externa affirmatur.*
 Trele.

" *Ecclesia Catholica ex hominibus unius temporis, est Cetus*
 " *eorum omnium, qui doctrinam Evangelij de Jesu Christo in carne*
 " *jam manifestato per universum mundum profitentur. Dicitur*
 " *ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ κυρίου ἡμετέρου, Heb. 2.5. i.e. mundus ille futurus, quem prae-*
 " *dixerant prophetae, & priore adventu Christi inchoatus, &c. Po-*
lani Syntag. l.7. c. 7.

" *Statuimus Ecclesiam quandam universalem externam per*
 " *totum orbem dispersam, nobis in sacris literis describi, qua vi-*
 " *sibili qualem politia unicum Ecclesiasticum Organicum corpus*
 " *constituit, sub quo omnes Ecclesiae particulares (Classicales, Pro-*
 " *vinciales & Nationales tanquam partes totius continentur. A-*
pollon. p.29.

" *Ubiunq; & quandocunq; fuerint homines Apostolica fide in-*
 " *formati, Christianam Electorum rem-publicam constituunt, et i-*
 " *am se dispersi in omnes orbis partes. Sic Antoninus Philosophus*
 " *civem Romanum dixit esse, quicunq; Romanis legibus viveret. Ita*
 " *quicunque Christianis legibus moribusq; vivit, ubiunq; sit nihil*
 " *interest, civis est Christianus, & ad publicum de regenda civitate*
 " *Dei consilium adhibendus, ut Ecclesia Catholica disciplina Ca-*
 " *tholica sit. Ram de Ecclesi.*

Against these testimonies M. E. saith pag. 5. that I bring the description of the visible Church out of several Authours, none of which, except Apollonius and Ramus, take it in my sense.

Ans. They all imply a Church Catholike, and that to be visible, and this Church Catholike visible, to be one, which is all I brought them for.

And whereas he seeks to blast Apollonius because he was pre-engaged, I answer, It is more then I know, he is still alive, and may answer for himself. And against Pet. Ramus he alledgeth a clause out of Beza's ep. before Aristotles Organ. But I could cite much more in his commendation out of others, but I write not to commend men, *valere quantum valere potest*, I am sure I have cause to blesse God for him.

Sometimes, saith Bifield, Church signifieth a company of men in

in one city or Province, that did outwardly professe the true religion, 1 Cor. 11. 18, 22. And so usually in the writings of Divines, the company throughout the world, so professing, is called the visible Church, *Bisfeld. on Art. 9.*

Catholike in the most evident sense agreeth to the Church now under the Gospel, since the partition wall between Jews and Gentiles was broken down, and yet in some sense it may agree to the Church from the beginning. *Idem.*

For particular Churches, either single or combined, either National, Provincial, Classical, or Congregational, it is not belonging to this question to discusse the Queries about them; and therefore I shall only set down some descriptions of them positively, as they are usually taken by others, and give you my present apprehensions of them.

A National Church is where all the visible, publike, religious Assemblies of a Nation, being parts of the Church Catholike, living under one politick, civil government, are by the profession of the same faith, and communion in the same worship and government, united into one body Ecclesiastick, or Ecclesiastical Republicke. Two things (as I conceive) are required to make a National Church. First, National agreement in the same faith and worship. Secondly, National union in one Ecclesiastical body, in the same community of Ecclesiastical government. The Churches in France and the Netherlands have the same faith and worship, and kinde of government, but they are not in the same National community thereof. See *Apollonius confid. cap. 3. Affect. 2.* "*Afferimus Ecclesiam visibilem in sacra Scriptura descriptam, non tantum fuisse Parochialem seu particularem, sed esse etiam Ecclesiam quandam Nationalem unius gentis aut regni, quae constat ex diversis & multis Ecclesijs Parochialibus, uno regimine Ecclesiastico junctis, & mutuâ quadam communiõne & societate Ecclesiasticâ visibili inter se devinctis.*" See clear proofs for National Churches under the Gospel, *Isa. 55. 5.* Thou shalt call a Nation which thou knewest not, and Nations which knew not thee, shall run unto thee. It is spoken of Christ under the Gospel. And there is set down both Gods call of a Nation, and a Nations answer to that call. And these two things are sufficient to make a Church. Also *Isa. 19. 24, 25.* In that day shall

What a National Church is.

Chap. I.

shall Israel be a third with Egypt, and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land, whom the Lord of hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance. It is a prophecy of the times under the Gospel, where Egypt and Assyria are promised to be called in, to be Churches as well as Israel, and are preferred in order before Israel, however it is clear those three Nations are owned, and blessed by God as three sister Churches. Also *Psa. 72. 11, 17.* All Kings shall fall down before him, all Nations shall serve him. All Nations shall call him blessed, i.e. Christ. *Mat. 21. 43.* The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. *Rom. 10. 19.* I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish Nation will I anger you, i.e. God choosing the Gentile Nations, and giving them the privileges of the Jews, it should anger the Jews, and provoke them to jealousy, *Isa. 65. 1.* I said, behold me, behold me, to a nation that was not called by my name. The Commission of the Apostles was to go teach and baptize all Nations (not Congregations only) i.e. some of all Nations, if they received the Christian faith; and the whole Nations, if the whole received it, *Mat. 4. 2.* Many Nations shall come and say, Let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and he will teach us his ways, and we will walk in his paths. *Isa. 52. 15.* He shall sprinkle many Nations, i.e. with his grace, *Jer. 4. 2.* The Nations shall bless themselves in him, and in him shall they glory. And *Rom. 4. 17.* Abraham is said to be a father of many Nations in a spiritual sense, as well as a carnal. In thee shall all the Nations of the earth be blessed. He is said to be the father of us all, *Rev. 11. 13.* The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ. The Ecclesiastical polities in converted kingdoms, are said to be commensurable to the civil. *Rev. 21. 24.* The Nations of them that are saved shall walk in the light of it, i.e. of the new Jerusalem. *Zac. 2. 11.* Many Nations shall be joyned unto the Lord in that day, and shall be my people. Whereby we see the current of the Scripture runs that God not only would convert Congregations out of several Nations, but the whole Nations, which also he performed, and many whole Nations joyned themselves to the Lord,

Lord, and made Christian Kingdoms or Common-wealths, Sect 3, though they proceeded not from the loins of one man, as the Israelites did, which some make the ground of the National Church of the Jews: yet we know there were proselytes of all Nations that were members of that Church, and had right to all the Ordinances as well as the Israelites, and servants that came not out of *Abrahams* loins.

And by the same reason when a part of a National Church shall joyn in particular consociation and community in a *City* or *Provinces*, or *Classis*, they may receive denomination from thence: the one containing a greater part of the Church Catholike, the other a lesse.

For the Church Catholike being a *similar body* retains the name *Church*, in what parts, parcels, or quantities soever it be divided into, for convenient community, until it be brought in *minimum quod sit*, as the Philosophers say, *i. e.* into the least parts that can enjoy publike communion in Ordinances, which is a particular Congregation. The division of the Church Catholike into particular Congregations, seemeth to me so be no further of divine institution, then as it fitly serveth for order and edification, by cohabitation, for enjoyment of Gods Ordinances together publikely (as the Jewish Church was divided by Synagogues, for their constant enjoyment of word, prayer, and discipline, which they could not constantly enjoy, as a National Church, by their National worship thrice in the year) and the same reason will by proportion carry it for *Classical*, *Provincial*, and *National* divisions, for community of a greater part of the Church.

Gerson Bucerus in *differt. de Gub. Eccles.* p. 18. hath this description of a particular Church. *Nos particularem Ecclesiam intelligimus quemlibet credentium catum in unam vocationem divinam, Evangelij predicationem, sacramentumq; Institutionum observationem adunatum, ac uni presbyterio subjunctum, sacros vero conventus uno aut pluribus locis agitantem. Nam paraciarum in quibus convenitur numerus, accidentaria res est, nihil ad Ecclesie particularis essentiam partians.* Now this seemeth to me to be a description of a Presbyterial or Classical Church, and so not to divide the Church Catholike into any lesse parts, for the enjoyment

Chap. 1.

enjoyment of all the usual publike Ordinances, then a Presbyterial, Classial Church : and so, though it be a description of a particular Church indeed, yet not of the least particular Church.

M. Cotton a reverend Minister in N.E. in his Catechism tells us, that a *visible Church is a mystical body, whereof Christ is the head, the Members, Saints, called out of the world, and united together into one Congregation, by an holy Covenant, to worship the Lord, and to edifie one another in all his holy Ordinances.* But (with due respect to so grave and worthy a man) much of this description seems to me to belong to an invisible Church, and not to a visible. First, because the matter thereof is the mystical body of Christ, consisting only of Saints called (not only from *Idols*, but) out of the world, and therefore truly godly, but much of the world is in the visible Church.

Secondly, Every Congregation, though it be in some sense of the mystical body of Christ, yet is not *the*, or a *mystical body* of Christ, for Christ hath but one mystical body; it behooveth therefore a particular Church to be defined with reference to the rest of the body, and not to the head only, it being but a part of the body. It would seem strange to define the *little toe* to be a body made up of flesh, blood and bone, of such a figure, enformed by the head, without declaring the reference of it to the rest of the body. Or a Corporation in *England* to be a body politick whereof the King is the head or Sovereign, without mentioning its reference to the rest of the Kingdom, whereof it is but a part, and so the King, the head or governor thereof, but secondarily, it being a part of that Kingdom whereof he was Sovereign. It is true, the Apostle saith, *the head of every man is Christ.* 1 Cor. 11. 3. i.e. they are of the body of Christ. So it may be said of every Congregation, Christ is the head thereof and that it is of his body or kingdom visible Ecclesiastical, but then we must add that which the Apostle doth of the Church of *Corinth*, 1 Cor. 12. 27. *Now ye are the body of Christ, & members of a part*, rendered in the old English Translation : *Members for the part in the new, Members in particular.* On which words saith *Beza in his large notes* upon

upon the place. *Nam omnes Ecclesia per orbem dispersa, diversa sunt unius corporis membra.* And the English Annotations upon the Bible, paraphrase it thus. *That is, members of this Church of Corinth, which is but a part of the Catholike Christian Church: for all the faithfull wheresoever they are, make the whole body: you Corinthians are not the whole body, but members only, neither all the members, but a part only of them.* Paræus renders it partitum, Peter Martyr, *Vos estis pars membrorum.* Thirdly, I dare not make a particular explicate holy covenant to be the form of a particular Church, as this definition seemeth to do, because I finde no mention of any such Covenant, besides the general imposed on Churches, nor example or warrant for it in all the Scriptures, and therefore cannot account it an Ordinance of God, but a prudential humane device to keep the members together, which in some places and cases may haply be of good use, so it be not urged as an Ordinance of God, and so it be not used to inthral any, and abridge them of liberty of removal into other places and Congregations, for their convenience; or urged as the form of a Church. I deny not but mutual consent of persons within such a vicinity, to joyn together constantly in the Ordinances of God under the inspection of such and such officers, is requisite to a particular Congregation.

But it is the general preceding Covenant sealed by baptism, and not this, that makes them of the body of Christ: they must be conceived to be of the visible body of Christ, before they can be fit members to constitute a particular Congregation; neither is it this particular Covenant that giveth right to the Ordinances of God, but the general, and therefore they must be judged to have right thereto before they be admitted as members of the Congregation. Only this mutual joyning together, and choice of such and such a Pastor or Teacher or ruling Elders, giveth such Officers a call to take immediate inspection over them, and administer the Ordinances of God belonging to their offices, unto them, to which they had right before their particular consociation, which is but an accidential thing, and may many waies be dissolved, and yet they not lose their right to Gods Ordinances by that dissolution. Such a consent, joyning, and call of, or submitting to a

Chap. 1. Presbytery, giveth to those Elders right of exercising of their offices, over, or towards them, rather then over others; and to them, to expect or require the Ordinances of God from those particular Officers, rather then from others.

Fourthly, For the enjoyment of all the Ordinances of God in one Congregation, it seemeth to me very *inconvenient* for some of the Ordinances, and altogether *impossible* for others. First, It is *inconvenient*, that a Church consisting of 7. 10. 20. or 30. should inflict the formidable sentence of excommunication against any person, to cast him out of communion, not only with themselves, but the whole Church. Catholike visible, and deliver him up to Satan. For if it be inflicted by the votes of the whole Congregation (as some would have it) many of the members being private men, and haply altogether illiterate and unexperienced, through want of age, education, or parts, are not able to understand the nature of the allegations and probations, they may be so intricate, or not able to apply the rule unto the case, for inflicting of a just censure; and may be in danger to bear particular favour or ill will unto their persons, and so apt to be swayed by love, pity or hopes from them, or to be overawed by fears or threatnings, being poor men, servants, children, workmen, tenants: and therefore our brethren for Congregational Churches, have of late, seeing this inconvenience, debarred the people from votes, and put it into the hands of the Elders only. See *M. Carrons* keys of the Church.

Yea even the Elders of one Congregation may be in danger of the same temptation, because of particular relations, and their dependance on them for maintenance. But suppose they were as free as Angels from temptations or infirmities (which they are not) yet the weightiness and solemnity of the censure would require to be performed by a Colledge of Elders of a combined Presbytery, that so it being not passed by the votes of 3. or 4. only, but by the joint advice, consent and authority of a combined Presbytery, may be the more dreadful to the party, and be the better accepted and submitted unto, without heart-burning and grudge against the particular Elders, or fears of revenge. Yet I deny not power in the Elders of the particular

particular Congregation, with the consent of the Congregation, Sect. 34
to exercise even that sentence upon an offender; if there be a
notorious clear cause; but I speak in regard of convenience,
in respect of the Elders, or the cause, or the person on whom
it is to be inflicted, who may be of civil eminency and de-
gree, &c.

It is worthy of note which *Zanchy* saith in this case. *In pre-*
cept. 4. p. 388. Si Ecclesia aliqua exigua sit, & non multis eru-
dis hominibus constans, non debet excommunicationem ferre, nisi
vicinioribus consultis Ecclesijs. Profecto neque Chirurgus, si sit
rimens Dei & prudens, seindit alicui manum aut brachium, nisi
audiat prius vicinorum etiam paritorum medicorum iudicium atq;
sententiam.

Secondly, It is impossible for one Congregation to enjoy all
the Ordinances of God within themselves. First, *Synods* and
Councils are acknowledged to be an Ordinance of God, and
particularly by that reverend Divine M. *Cotton* himself, and he
groundeth it on *1 Cor. 15*. And though some of our brethren for
Congregational Churches wave that place, yet grant the thing,
and are members of one at this time; and this Ordinance all
men will grant, cannot be had in one Congregation, but some-
times requires the help of a whole *Province, Kingdom, yea many*
Kingdoms. Yea secondly, The Ordinances that more nearly and
particularly concern a particular Congregation cannot be per-
formed by that alone. For how can a Congregation, of private
Christians try the sufficiency of an *Elder*, to be elected over
them, to labour in word and doctrine? and if they have a tri-
ed man among them, who shall give him imposition of hands,
which belongeth only unto Elders of the same kinde to per-
form? Neither have our brethren of Congregational Churches
(whatever their judgement is herein) ever dared (as far as I
have heard) to permit private members to impose hands on
their Elders, but alwaies desired Elders of other Congregati-
ons to do it, and therefore they cannot have this Ordinance
within themselves. And though this seemeth to some a thing
of small moment, yea, but a complement, yet it is an Ordi-
nance of God. The truth is, election is but a nomination of a
man which they think fit to be invested with, and put into such

Chap. 1.

an office, and to whom so invested they are willing to submit themselves in the Lord, but that giveth no power at all to execute the office, nor doth it invest him with it, for that is given and done by Ordination, and imposition of hands, which they cannot give because they are but private Christians out of office, and the lesse ought to be blessed of the greater. And the Apostle *Heb. 6. 12.* reckoneth it up amongst the principles of Religion, and part of the foundation. Which place *Hen. Jacob* urgeth vehemently to overthrow the lawfulness and essence of all the Ministers of the Church of England, because (saith he) they have erred in the foundation, not having right, and due imposition of hands of the Presbytery: though by his leave, he was mistaken, for all those that imposed their hands on them, were Presbyters. But this dealing is not fair, to hold imposition of hands a part of the foundation, that so they may overthrow the Ministry of the Church of England; and then make it but a complement, that they may establish their own. Now this impossibility befalls a Church, either in the beginning of it, and first constitution, or may at other times by mortality of Elders, and will be frequent, yea, constant in small Congregations, where there is but one or two preaching Elders, as is the case of most, if not all Congregations.

M. Norton a reverend Minister in N. E. in his answer to *Apolonius*, hath a description of a particular Church, much like this. *Ecclesia particularis, est cœna fidelium, visibile vinculum mutui consensus politici unitus, ad incedendum in fidē & observantiā Evangelij, juxta ordinem seu politiam Evangelij.* p. 22. But I see nothing in the description but is applicable to the Church-Catholike. For they are the company of believers, and they are politically united together, under Christ a political head, and they are united together by a visible bond of voluntary consent to yeeld outward subjection to the government of Christ. See all these particulars yeelded by *M. Hooker, Survey*, p. 3. His own words I shall cite, Chap. 2. Sect. 1. And *M. Norton* himself, *Resp.* p. 50. acknowledgeth thus much, *Omnis Ecclesia unitur politice sub eodem capite. 2. Ununtur eadem formā Politicā & cultus. 3. Ununtur relatione sororum politicarum, & hac unione communi fundatur communio Ecclesiarum inter se.*

And because it is not rationally probable that the Churches Sect. 3.
of Jerusalem, Rome, Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, or the seven
Churches of Asia were merely Congregational, but rather Pres-
byterial, as hath been by the Reverend Assembly, the London
Ministers, and divers others abundantly evidenced; it seem-
eth difficult to me to finde in the New Testament an expresse
Instance or example of a Congregational Church, standing and
continuing so by it self. The Church of Cenchrea mentioned
Rom. 16. 1. is the most probable, because of the conceived smal-
nesse of the place, yet it is not certain, for it was a port Town,
8. miles from Corinth, as Holyoke tels us, and Gualter in Rom.
16. saith it was *Oppidum Corinthiorum navium statione celebra-
rimum, & ideo frequens valde & populosum.*

The clearest evidence is from 1 Cor. 14. 14. for a particu-
lar Congregational Church. *Let your women keep silence in the*
CHURCHES, which word (*Churches*) seems to import several
Congregations meeting in several places, to enjoy publike Or-
dinances by the Corinthians (*your women*) and these Congre-
gations are called Churches, and yet were all one combin-
ed Church of Corinth, often spoken of in the singular
number.

But this dispute belongs not to this question, yet the pre-
sent difference of opinions and practices have caused me a little
to dilate upon this subject, beyond the explication of the term.
And I understand by particular Churches, any, or all the fore-
mentioned Churches, whether National, Provincial, Pres-
byterial, Classical, or Congregational; and this last princi-
pally; for those that have first moved this question, mean prin-
cipally, if not solely, the Congregational Church, because
(as I suppose) they hold no other particular Churches but
such.

The fourth term to be opened is, *What is meant by Prima, Sect. 4.
vel Secundaria & Orta.* This distinction, or at least in these
terms, is not ancient; for M. Parker in his *Palæstra Eccles.* was
the first that sprung it, as far as I know. *Primum* in Logick is
defined to be *Quod est sui Originis: Ortum, quod oritur a primo.*
Secundarium is properly that which is next after the first in
order, for it is an ordinal. I do not mean strictly, next imme-
diately,

Chap. 1.

diarily, but in the largest sense, for that which hath not the first right or first consideration, but a *Posterior*. In this Question, *Primum*, or *first*, is meant, that which hath the priority in consideration. Whether in our apprehension of Churches we are to begin at the Church-Catholike, and descend to particular Churches, or begin at the particular, and ascend to the Church Catholike? which notion is first in distinct knowledge, whether *Ecclesia Universalis*, and *Particularis*? Whether the nature, priviledges, and Ordinances, belong first to the Church Catholike? and secondarily to the particular Churches: I do not mean (as M. Ellis suppoeth) that the power or Ordinances go by way of discention or derivation of power from the Church-Catholike, in dispensation of Ordinances, but in consideration: for I acknowledge power to be given immediatly to every particular Church therein, yet under regulation of a greater part of Church-Officers, in case of male-administration. The properties and power of water is primarily given to the whole element of water, but is immediatly, yet secondarily in the particular parcels thereof.

But the Catholike Church is the primary in a threefold respect. First, as the Orthodox Catholike Church is a means or instrument by the Ordinances, Ministry and members thereof, in the several parts and places thereof, to convert, adde, and bring in more new members thereunto; and is continually conquering out of Satans and Antichristi Kingdom, and leavening the world with the doctrine of Christ. Secondly, as the Church-Catholike affords masters and members, to make up or constitute the particular Congregations, which consist only of the members of the Catholike Church, gathered up from any place of the world into particular vicinities. Thirdly, in regard the Ordinances and priviledges of the Church, are primarily intended and given by Christ, by one Charter unto the whole Church, and to particular Churches secondarily, as parts thereof. And so they partake of the benefits and priviledges of the Church, not because they are members of the particular Churches, though there they have the immediate opportunity, but of the Church-Catholike. As a Corporation already constituted by Charter, receiveth in free men continually, and giveth freedom

freedome to new members which come any way to have right Sect. 4.
thereto, and those members have right to the priviledges of the
City, not because they are of such a street, or ward, or company,
but because they are free of the City.

So that though I have retained the terms of M. Parkers distinction, *prima* and *Orta sive secundaria*, yet my question differs much from his. For he compares the particular Churches who delegate and send members or commissioners to constitute a Classis or Synod, with such a ministerial Church, a Church of Officers so constituted, for some especial ends, *pro tempore*, which some call a representative Church: and I confesse with him that such a Church may well put on the notion of *Ecclesia Orta*, and the particular Churches out of which these members are delegated, may in some sense (in reference unto them) put on the notion of *Ecclesia prima*. Yet I do not conceive that those particular Churches give either the office, or the power in *actu primo*, whereby those delegated Commissioners do act when they are met, but by such delegation they do evocate and call forth the exercise of that power which Christ hath annexed to their office habitually, in *actu secundum*, to act *pro hic et nunc*, for the good of all those Churches so sending, which acts of theirs binde the delegating Churches to submission in the Lord. But in my Question the whole Church Catholike visible is compared with the particular Churches, and they are considered as parts thereof.

CHAP. II.

Proofs by Scripture that there is a Church-Catholike visible.

NOW I have opened the terms of my Question, I finde two Questions in stead of one, and whether of them is the most difficult I cannot tell. Whereas the subject of every Question useth to be taken for granted, and the predicate only to be proved, I finde the subject of my Question exceedingly questioned.

Chap. 2.

oned and opposed, and that by some of our own Divines; and therefore though my first aim in undertaking the Question was to clear the Predicate, yet I must crave leave to confirm the subject, or else whatsoever I shall say of the Predicate will be as a house built on the sand, or a Castle in the air; for if there be no universal visible Church, then it is not capable of being either *Prima* or *secundaria*.

In handling both these Questions, I shall follow my wonted method. I preferre one Divine Testimony before ten arguments, and one good argument before ten humane testimonies.

Sect. I.

First then, *Whether there be a Church-Catholike visible?*

I know that our Divines in answer to the Pontificians, do deny the Church-Catholike to be visible, as *Zanchy*, *Gerard*, *Whitakers*, *Chamier*, and *Ames* against *Bellarmino*, and *Sadeel* against *Turrianus*, and against the *Monks Confession of faith*, and *D. Willet in his Synopf*.

For they restraining the signification of the word *Church*, to the better part of the Church, the *Elect* only, and considering them in respect of their internal communion with Christ their head, and not their external communion one with another by Ordinances, did deny the Church-Catholike to be visible. *Nec a quovis impio, nec pio videri potest*, saith *Whitaker*. And if the word *Church* be taken in that sense, it is most certainly true, it must needs be invisible, But there is also an external communion (as hath been shewed before) which the visible members have, both with Christ and one with another, which is visible, and makes the enjoyers thereof visible one to another, and to all others also, *viz.* their praying one with another and for another, and their hearing the Word, and receiving the Lords Supper together as occasion is offered, and their receiving all those as visible members of the visible mystical Kingdom and body of Christ, that are admitted in any part of the Church by baptism, and the avoiding of such as are any where excommunicated, and the receiving again into communion those that are any where absolved.

So that there is an external visible Kingdom of Christ, as well as an internal and invisible, and the elect are of the visible Kingdom

dom as well as of the invisible; they are as *Ezechiels* wheels, a Sect. 1.
wheel in the midst of a wheel.

It is true which reverend *M. Hooker* puts me in minde of, that these 4. Questions between the Pontificians and our Divines: are distinct. *Utrum Ecclesia sit visibilis? Utrum Ecclesia visibilis potest deficere? An sit semper frequens & gloriosa? Utrum Ecclesia opus habet visibili monarchâ & summo iudici?* But they are rather marshalled so by our Divines in their answers, then distinguished by themselves; for they often confound *visible*, *conspicuous*, *glorious*, *manifest*, *specious*, *splendid*, *magnifical*, and *flourishing* together, yet the Church is visible when *latent* under persecutions, and is deprived of the other properties, for all the members even then are not invisible members of Christ. *Cameron* granteth that these properties may betide the visible Church, but not alwaies (and so say some of the Papists also) and that when they do betide the Church, they rather shew *Quid sit Ecclesia, quam qua sit*: that it cannot be discerned which is the true Church by these accidents of perpetual clarity. *Cameron de Conspic. Eccl.*

The Pontificians notion of the Church Catholike is very absurd, for they hold the name *Church Catholike* to belong to one Church, *viz. the Church of Rome*: and that being the Church Catholike, and comprizing the universality of the Church in it self, all that will be members of the Church-Catholike must submit unto them, and be members of that. Of which *Tylen. in Synag.* saith well, *Orbem urbi includunt.*

And the necessity which they make that this one visible Church should be under one visible universal head on earth, *viz. the Pope*, as Christs vicar general, is as absurd: and therefore they are worthily confuted by our Divines.

But to deny an external Kingdome or Church of Christ upon earth: or to deny the visibility or perceptibility of it: or the unity of it, or the univesality of it under the Gospel (is as I conceive) as absurd on the other side. To the particulars I shall speak more fully in following Chapters. I finde reverend *M. Hooker* in his *Survey of Church-Discipline*, par. 1. pag. 3. acknowledging Christ a political head by his especial guidance in

Chap. 2.

"means and dispensations of his Ordinances, as well as a mysti-
 "cal by spiritual influence : and the Church a political body as
 "well as a mystical. The political body or Church-visible (saith
 "he) results out of that relation, which is betwixt the profes-
 "sors of the faith, when by voluntary consent they yeeld out-
 "ward subjection to that government of Christ which in his
 "word he hath prescribed, and as an *external head* exerciseth
 "by his Word, Spirit, and Discipline, by his Ordinances and
 "Officers over them, who have yeelded themselves subjects to
 "his headship and supream authority. And pag. 45. *The visible*
 "*Church* is truly stiled and judged by Scripture light to be the
 "visible body of Christ, over whom he is a head by political go-
 "vernment and guidance, which he lends thereunto, 1 Cor. 12.
 "12. And that it is a visible politrick body, appears quite
 "through the whole Chapter, but especially ver. 27, 28. Be-
 "cause in that Church God set Orders and Officers, Some Apo-
 "stles, Teachers, Helpers, Governments. The like to this Eph. 4.
 "12, 13. Again p. 16. *The Church is the visible Kingdom* in which
 "Christ reigns by the scepter of his word and Ordinances, and
 "execution of Discipline.

The testimony cited out of Ames by me was this, *Congrega-*
tionis ille particularis, sunt quasi partes similes Ecclesie Catho-
licae, atque adeo & nomen, & naturam eam participant. And
 further he saith, *Illi qui professione uniti sunt fideles, dum reman-*
ent in illa societate, sunt membra illius Ecclesie, sicut etiam Ec-
clesie Catholicae, quoad statum externum. Ames. medul. l. 1. c. 22.
 Sect. 11.

And in his *Bellarminus enervatus* he saith, *Nos fatemur Eccle-*
siam militantem visibilem esse quoad formam accidentalem & ex-
ternam, in suis partibus, & singularium & conjunctim, &c. Here
 I am taxed by M. Ellis vind. p 53. for citing this authour for me
 who is known to be against me. But I answer, I dealt candidly
 with D. Ames, acknowledging him to be against a Church-Ca-
 tholike visible in some sense, and yet not against it in some o-
 ther sense, as his expresse words declare. Neither doth he reject
 in terminis, an universal visible Church in my sense, as M. Ellis af-
 firms; but my position stands good for ought that I finde in D. A-
 mes, though I cannot consent to his judgement in all things.

But

Seck. 2.

But let M. Ellis observe that *Ames* doth not hold the Church which is mystically one, to be a genus, or one generically, *sed quasi species specialissima, vel Individuum, quia nullas habet species proprias dictas. Dicitur igitur Catholica, non ut res sua, genus, aut generale aliquid significat, sed ut denotat aliquid significat, sed ut denotat aliquid integraliter universale (ut quum dicimus Orbis universus) quia complectitur fideles omnium gentium, omnium locorum, & omnium temporum. Med. l. 1. c. 31. n. 18, 19.*

Again cap. 32. n. 5. he saith, *Ecclesia particularis, respectu communis illius naturae, quae in omnibus particularibus Ecclesijs reperitur, est species Ecclesiae in genere, sed respectu Ecclesiae Catholicae, quae habet rationem integri, est membrum ex aggregatione variorum membrorum singularium compositum, atque respectu ipsorum est etiam integrum.* Which is as much as in this part of the question I contended for, viz. that the Church-Catholike in regard of the external and accidental form, is an integral; and not a genus. But M. Ellis makes the Church-Catholike one only in regard of the internal essential form, and not in regard of any external form, wherein he expressly crosseth *Ames*. And therefore I retort it upon him again, that he cite a man for him, which is expressly against him. The external form is that which is visible, and if the Church-Catholike be one in the external accidental form, it must needs be integrally and visibly one.

Seck. 2.

But I come to Scripture proofs, which are the most sure, because they are a divine testimony. And first I shall shew you that an Oecumenical universal Church was frequently foretold in Scripture, *Psa. 22. 27. All the ends of the World, shall remember, and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him.* Which comprehends all places, all the ends of the earth, and all persons that should be converted, all the kindreds of the Nations: and by worshipping is meant embracing the true religion, and performance of religious duties. So *Psa. 72. 8. He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth.* It is a prophecy concerning Christ in the times of the Gospel: where he is set forth by his Kingly office; and the extent of his Kingdom is set out to be to the ends of the earth. This is his external political Kingdom, because it is set out by the external prayers and prayes and gifts that should

Chap. 2.

be tendred unto him by his Subjects, and by the judgement, peace, and flourishing estate that he shall bestow upon them. So *Psa. 86. 9.* *All Nations whom thou hast made, shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name.* This is a prophecy like the former, So *Isa. 2. 2, 3, 4.* *It shall come to passe in the last daies, that the mountain of the Lords house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all Nations shall flow unto it, and many people shall go and say, Come ye, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us his waies, and we will walk in his paths. For out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, and he shall judge among the Nations, and rebuke many people, &c.* Where is set down Christs call of all the Nations, and the time of this call, in the last daies, i.e. the times under the Gospel, as the Apostle *Act. 2. 17.* expounds the like phrase in *Joel 2. 28.* And here is the means of the call, by the Law out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem: and the answer to this call, All Nations shall flow unto it: and there is Christs executing his propheticall office by publike teaching them in his house, by his Ambassadors, and his Kingly office in judging and rebuking. So *Isa. 25. 6.*

So *Daniel 7. 14.* *There was given unto him (Christ) Dominion and glory, and a Kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him.* And in the New Testament *Matt. 28. 9.* *Go, teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* *Rom. 15. 11, 12.* *Rev. 14. 6.* But because these places will be turned off with this answer, that some of all Nations should embrace the Gospel, and be turned unto the Lord, not the whole Nations: I answer, that experience hath proved it true of multitudes of great Nations, that wholly did embrace the Gospel, and submitted unto it. Neither can any of these places be avoided (as some plead) by the general Kingdom of Christ, which is given him over all Nations, whereby he is head over all things to the Church, *Eph. 1. 2.* For it is clear they are meant of that Kingdom wherein are prayers, praises, gifts, worship, service, and attendance upon Gods Ordinances, flowing unto Christ, worshipping before him, and glorifying his name, as the several

texts expresse; and these things are proper to the visible Sect. 3.
Church. So also *Zech. 14. 9. And the Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one,* which is clearly meant of one religion and way of worship of God in Christ.

But secondly, I will give you places of Scripture where the word Church is applied both indefinitely and generally, which cannot be understood of any particular Churches. See first *Act. 8. 3. Saul made havock of the Church.* To which may be added that of *Gal. 1. 13. I persecuted the Church of God, and wasted it.* I shewed before that this must needs be a visible Church, for they could not else have been persecuted; persecution is a visible opposition of a visible Church. And certainly *Saul* could not discern who were of the invisible company, but persecuted promiscuously *all that were that way.* Neither was it a particular Church, for this persecution was in *Jerusalem*, and in every *Synagogue*, and it reached to *Damascus*, and even to strange cities, *Act. 26. 11.* So that by Church here is meant an indefinite number of visible Churches or Congregations, which were in no other community but profession of the same faith, and an indefinite is equivalent to a general: which axiome although it should not be stretched according to the old rule, *Omne indefinitum potest esse infinitum*, it being without limits, yet it is true in suo genere, it is as large as a general. But this we may safely say, that by the same reason that the word Church would reach all those Churches, it would reach all the Churches in the world.

Reverend M. Hooker excepteth against these two places, and affirms that the word Church is taken here by a *Synechdoche* for the particular Church of *Jerusalem*, and not all that neither, but only such Christians as forsook *Moses* ceremonial Law, and not the Christian Jewish Church. *Surr. c. 15. p. 269.* Because saith he, his Commission was to pursue such as he found of that way.

The answer to this exception will lie in the meaning of these words, *all that he found of that way*, whether by that way, be meant the forsaking the ceremonial Law, or confessing Christ to be the *Messiah*: If the former, then *Paul* would have found

Chap. 2. but little work in *Jerusalem*, for the Jewish Christians did generally cleave to the ceremonial Law. As the Elders told *Paul* *Act. 21. 20.* Thou seest how many myriads of the Jews do believe, and they are all zealous of the Law, and therefore he need not persecute them for neglect thereof, for they were zealous therein, yea, the Apostles themselves observed that in *Jerusalem* a long time. But the persecution was such, as that they were all scattered abroad except the Apostles; and therefore it was for Christianity that he persecuted them. It was to cause them to blaspheme, as *Paul* himself expounds it: now though reducing of them to the ceremonial Law had been an error, yet it was not a blasphemy, for then the Apostles themselves should have lived in blasphemy. Surely it was to cause them to blaspheme the Lord Jesus Christ, and deny him to be the Messiah. It is most likely that *Saul's* Commission was according the former decree of the chief Priests, *Ioh. 9. 22.* That if any did confesse that he was Christ, he should be put out of the Synagogue. And this appears by what *Ananias* saith to Christ concerning *Paul*, *Act. 9. 14.* Here he hath authority from the chief Priests to bind all that call on thy name. And *vers. 2.* If he found any that way; Not all of *Jerusalem*, or if he found any of *Jerusalem* that were fled thither, but any Jews; for the Gentiles had not yet received the Gospel. For *Chap. 10.* *Peter* was charged for eating with *Cornelius* and his company, that were Gentiles. And they that were scattered abroad by *Saul*, preached the Gospel to none but to the Jews only, *Act. 11. 19.* And some of those whom *Saul* persecuted were men of *Cyprus* and *Cyrene*, *Act. 11. 20.* But it was all that call on thy name, not all that had forsaken the ceremonial Law, for that very few Jews as yet had done, if any at all. And this was the reason, as I conceive, that the commission given to *Saul* by the chief Priests, reached the Jews at *Damascus*, and other cities, because they were not fallen off from the ceremonial Law, but kept fellowship with the Jewish Church at *Jerusalem*, and came up to the feasts still, and so were under their Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and liable to their censure, and they could write to the rulers of those Synagogues to see them punished.

Also it is said upon the conversion of *Saul*, *Act. 9. 31.* Then had

had the Churches rest in all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria. Sect. 3. which yet were but some parts of the Church, (in the singular number) which he persecuted. Now if Saul had persecuted only the members of the Church of Jerusalem, which had forsaken Moses law, then they might have had rest before, for all him, for they should not have been within his commission: but he persecuted them also. So our brethren themselves expound it. *Except. p. 17.* Also it is said *Act. 12. 1.* that Herod stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the Church, and he killed James, and attached Peter. Now this was a visible Church, because a Church liable to visible persecution, and an Organical Church, because the persecution was against the Officers; and the Catholike Church: for it is not said, Certain of the Church of Jerusalem, but indefinitely, The Church: and the two persons named were not Officers or members of the Church of Jerusalem, but Officers of the whole Church, being Apostles.

Also it is said *Act. 2. 47.* God added to the Church daily such as should be saved. Or, saved men, as some render it. Not that all should be saved, or were saved men that were added unto it, for there were many hypocrites added, but those that should be saved, or were sanctified, were added. Which Church was not a particular Congregational Church, but the Catholike.

Reverend M. Hooker excepteth against this, and saith, that "it was not the Catholike Church, but the Apostolical Christian Church now erected, and not the whole company of "beleevers in the whole world, for such a company they never "saw nor knew, and therefore could not be added to them. *Serv. c. 15. p. 270.*

Ans. It is true indeed, it was to the Apostolical Christian Church, but not to any particular Congregational Church. For first, no man by conversion is added unto, or made a member of a or the particular Church where he was converted, but is made a member of the Catholike society of Christians by conversion, and then joins himself unto some particular society of them.

Secondly, This Apostolical Christian Church was not a Congregational Church, for those 120 (suppose them the 12 and :

Chap. 2.

70 and some others) were many of them men of *Galilee*, and resided at *Jerusalem* but for a time, *per accidens*, by command, until they were further endued with the *holy Ghost*. And those 3000 that were added to them, *Act. 2.41.* were men out of every nation under heaven, *ver. 5.* and their particular countries, named, *ver. 9, 10, 11.* And this is our brethrens own exposition, in their exceptions to the proofs from the Church of *Jerusalem*, p. 16. Where they say "they were not settled dwellers at *Jerusalem*, but strangers, commorants of the 10 Tribes which "were dispersed, and were but sojourners at *Jerusalem*, coming up to the feast, having their wives, and children, and "families at home, to whom they used after a time to return. "And that this continuing stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine "and fellowship, was but only while they were there at *Jerusalem*. Yea, some of them were of *Judea*, *ver. 9.* and so of the "countrey round about, and that of them might be Church- "es erected in their proper dwellings, is rationally suppose- "able.

And the proof *M. Hooker* giveth (to shew it was not the Church-Catholike) from *Act. 2.42.* They continued stedfastly (*ἠκολούθησαν*) in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship; makes much against a Congregational Church, as I conceive. For the Apostles were not Congregational Elders to *Jerusalem*, but general Officers of the Church-Catholike by their Commission. So that this communion of theirs with the Apostles, was not a particular Church-communion, but a Catholike communion of Catholike members (not reduced into particular Congregations) with Catholike Officers. Neither might the Apostles joyn as particular Elders of the Church of *Jerusalem*. For how could they binde themselves by an holy Covenant to the constant performance, or enjoyment of all the Ordinances of God, to or with them, seeing their charge was to go over all the world; yet such a Covenant our Brethren say, is requisite in a particular Congregation. Neither as yet were there any particular Elders of the particular Church of *Jerusalem* constituted; nor do we finde it expressed how long after. If it had been said, that they continued in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, with the Elders of *Jerusalem*, it had carried some probability.

Moreover.

Moreover, it could not be the communion of a particular Sect. 3. Church, because they had the *Lords Supper* in several companies. *Breaking bread from house to house*. Gods providence ordered it so that the Christian Church should be (as I may say) at the very birth of it, Catholike, in regard of Officers and members, before any reduction into particular societies under particular Officers. It was so, potentially, from the giving of the Apostles commission, and now it is actually in the members as well as Officers, before their number could make up Congregations in several countries.

"Yea, but (saith he) it is not to the whole company of "beleevers in the whole world, for such a company they never "saw nor knew, and therefore could not be added to them. p.270.

Ans. It is not requisite they should see or know them all by face, but know that there was, or was to be such a company which was already begun. It is like every member of the Church of *Ierusalem*, did never see or know all the *myriads* that were of that Church, nor do every member of the greatest Congregation in *London*, know all the members thereof. A forreigner that is naturalized by Parliament, and so added to this Kingdom, did never see nor know all the whole Kingdom.

Again *1 Cor. 10. 32. Give no offence to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the Church of God.* Where the word *Church* cannot signifie the Elect only, nor any particular Congregation or Kingdom, but indefinitely it reacheth the whole body though in never so remote parts.

"*M. Hooker* excepteth against this proof, because (saith he) the "Church here spoken of, is contra-distinct to the Jews, and therefore cannot comprehend the whole company of beleevers "through the whole world, because some beleevers were of the "Jews. *Serv. c. 15. p. 270.*

Ans. It is true, I finde *Beza* in his large notes upon the place, interpreting the Jews here spoken of, to be the beleeving Jews, and the Gentiles to be the beleeving Gentiles. *Partibus subiectis solum.* But then he crosseth *M. Hooker* in making the Church an *integrum*, and Jews and Gentiles to be the *integrant parts*. Yet

Chap. 2.

he adds as the more probable meaning, *Nisi malimus istud Iudeis & Graecis de extraneis intelligere, quorum etiam nobis sit habendaratio, &c.*

And all others that I have met withall interpret the words of the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles in opposition to Christians. Or else of the believing Jews and Gentiles making one Church, but most in the first sense. So *Calvin*, *Iudeos & Gentiles nominat, non tantum quia duobus illis generibus constabat Dei Ecclesia, sed ut doceat nos omnibus etiam alienis esse debitores, ut eos si fieri potest lucrificamus.* So *Paraus* on the vers. Also *Amb. Thomas Aqu. Goran*, and the *English Annotations* on the place. And the reason divers of them render is, because the unbelieving Jews (abhorring Idols) might be beat off from Christ by seeing Christians eating things sacrificed to Idols: (which is the particular offence here mentioned by the Apostle) and the unbelieving Gentiles might be confirmed in their Idolatry thereby: and the believers both of Jews and Gentiles take offence at it.

“Again (saith *M. Hooker*) that Church is here meant, whom a man may offend by his practice in the particulars mentioned: but he cannot offend the whole company of believers, through the whole world: because a scandal must be seen or known certainly, &c.

Ans. All indefinite negative precepts (as against murder, adultery, theft, &c.) as they are general for the time, binding *semper & ad semper*, so concerning place and persons; though no one man is ever like to have opportunity or possibility to commit them in every place and upon every person. So is this prohibition.

Some might give offence in one place, some in another, and some one in many places, in those travelling times; and the whole was liable to offence, though haply not by one man, and therefore the object is set down indefinitely to comprehend the whole. Yea, the word comprizeth not the Church *Entire*, but *Organical* and *combined*, for they may so be offended, and we are not to affront or offend them: the greater the part of the whole body is, and the more compleated, the greater respect is to be had to it, that we give no offence thereunto.

Also Gal. 4. 26. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. By Jerusalem is meant a Church, because it is that which brings forth children to God, which sometime may be desolate and in sorrow, because of the paucity and dispersion of them, sometime is bidden to rejoyce for the multitude and prosperity of them, as vers. 27. It is also an Evangelical Church freed from the ceremonies of the Law, because it is called Jerusalem, answering to Jerusalem that was in Paul's time, and was in bondage with her children, vers. 25. i. e. to the Church of the Jews that were under the ceremonial Law, and would not forsake it, which was soon after destroyed. The Apostle changeth the manner of this speech from the person of Sarah, who was the type of the Evangelical Covenant, to Jerusalem, which is the Church wherein the Evangelical doctrine and Covenant is preached; and this Jerusalem is the seed of Sarah, i. e. the Evangelical Church is the seed and offspring of the Evangelical Covenant. This Evangelical Church is called Jerusalem and Sion in Heb. 12. 22, which text is parallel to this: and Rev. 21. 2, 3. the New Jerusalem. The legal ceremonial service did beget all under it to an external bondage, and brought them up under bondage; especially hypocrites which were not led by the Law to Christ, but rather hindered from him, they were in external and internal bondage. It cannot be the Church Triumphant, for that is not the mother of the Church militant, that hath no Ordinances to beget children. And though it be called Jerusalem which is above, yet that is meant because it hath its Original from heaven: as Rev. 21. the New Jerusalem is said to come down from heaven; and we are said to be begotten from above. 2. Because their conversation is in heaven, Phil. 3. 20. 3. Because they shall in the end be brought thither. It cannot be the invisible Church as so considered, but must be a visible organical Church, because it doth no otherwise become a mother of children, but by the use of Ordinances and keys committed to her. It is by the preaching of the word, that children are begotten in her womb, the seed is the word: and by the same word as milk, and the use of the Sacraments, they are nourished in their mothers house, and as a mother she educates and rules them by discipline. And this

Chap. 2.

cannot be a particular Church, but must be the general, because the Apostle saith it is the *mother of us all*; the Apostle puts in himself and all beleevers. And the 27 *vers.* makes it more plain, because the Apostle confirms and explains himself by a quotation out of *Isa. 54. f. 2, 3.* which sheweth the calling in of the Gentiles to be of this Church. And thus all the protestant Expositours that I have met with, expound it. *Calvin* on the place saith, *Calestem vocat, non qua calo sit inclusa, non qua sit quarendum extra mundum; est enim diffusa Ecclesia per totum orbem, & in terra peregrinatur.* *Luther* also saith, This heavenly *Ierusalem* which is above, is the Church, i.e. the faithful dispersed throughout the whole world, which have one and the same Gospel, faith, Christ, holy Ghost, and Sacraments. — It is the Church which is now in the world, and not the Triumphant Church. — To be the mother of us all, it is necessary that this our mother should be on earth among men, as also her generation is. — This spiritual *Ierusalem* which took her beginning in corporeal *Ierusalem*, hath not any certain place, but is dispersed throughout the whole world. This free mother is the Church it self, the spouse of Christ, of whom we are all gendred. So *Musculus, Perkins, Baldwin, and Bullinger, Loquitur de Ecclesia in terris ex omnibus gentibus collecta.* It is another body which is correspondent to *Sarah*, viz. the Christian Church. *Beza* and *Calvin* on *Hebr. 12. 22.* a text parallel to this hath these words, *Calestem Ierusalem intelligit, qua per totum mundum extruenda erat, quemadmodum Angelus apud Zachariam funiculum ejus ab Oriente usque in Occidentem extendit.*

Again *Eph. 3. 10.* To the intent that unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God. This Church was not a particular Congregation, neither was it the Church of the elect, neither doth *Beza* so expound it (as is alledged) for he speaks here-upon of the government of it *sub variata Oeconomia*: neither was it the Church of the Gentiles only (which yet is more then one Congregation) neither can the circumstances carry it so beyond control, as is alledged, because of the mysteries here spoken of, that “*were kept secret since the beginning of the world,* and

"and the *multifarious* wisdom which was now made known by Sect. 4.
 "the Churches, but were before made known to the Church of
 "the Jews, as M. Hooker conceives, p. 271. For the mysteries
 revealed in the New Testament, were never known to the Jews
 before. *Eye never saw them, nor ear heard them, nor entred it*
into the heart of man to conceive of them. But he that is least in
the kingdom of the Gospel, knows more then John the Baptist. But
 it was the Church-Catholike under the Gospel, whereof Paul
 was made a Minister, as it is *vers. 7.* It is that *body of Christ,*
the Church, whereof Paul was made a Minister, as himself saith
more fully, Col. 1.24,25. which must needs be the *external, vi-*
sible, organical, Catholike Church of Christ, consisting of Jew
and Gentile.

Again it is said in 1 Cor. 12.28. *God hath set some in the Church, Sect. 4.*
first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers. The Church
 here spoken of, is *not the Church Triumphant,* for that hath no
 officers but Christ the head, there shall be no Pastors and
 Teachers, *quâ such,* yet such are in this Church *vers. 8.* neither
 shall there be any gifts of healing, tongues, miracles, Deacons,
 or ruling Elders. Neither is it the *Church as invisible,* consisting
 of the elect only: for the invisible Church *quâ invisible,* hath no
 Officers neither.

For though intentionally they are indeed given for the good
 of the Elect, yet they are set in the *visible Church.* For both
 the ordinary and extraordinary Officers were visible messen-
 gers; and some of them but visible beleevers only, for *Judas*
had obtained part in the Apostleship and ministry, and was sent to
 preach and work miracles: and many Prophets were not of
 the invisible number: for *many shall say, Lord, Lord, we have*
prophecied in thy name, &c. and yet shall not be saved. But to
 be sure they were sent to afford the Saints visible communion in
 Ordinances.

Again, *This is not meant of the Church entitive,* which is a
similar, and (as I may say) an *homogeneal* body, every mem-
 ber as a member being equal, and of the same capacity: but it
 is meant of the *Church Organical,* an *heterogeneal, dissimilar*
 body, because here are set down the Officers. I mean *dissimi-*
lar and heterogeneal in regard of the *integral parts, viz.* the se-
 veral

Chap. 2.

veral Congregations, because they all have or ought to have the same kinde of Officers and members, as so many flocks of sheep under several shepherds. Therefore the several particular Churches are called by some, an *Epitome* of the great body: now the *Epitome* hath no other parts then the great body hath. *Neither is here meant a particular Church, but all collectively, that were within the bounds of the Apostles commission, which was the Church in the whole world, Go teach all nations, &c.* and all the Churches which have teachers over them, which all Churches in the world have, or ought to have, and yet all these are called but one Church, *one body*, vers. 20. And this whole is one *Organical body*, v. 12. *As we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.* Rom. 12. 4, 5.

M. Hooker hath two Expositions of, or answers to this place. First, that the Church here meant is *totum universale, existing and determined in its actings by the particulars.*

Answ. That cannot be, for *genus quâ genus* can have no officers, seeing it is a second notion abstracted only in the minde: therefore the Church *quâ totum universale* is no existing politic: if it hath Officers it must be considered as an *integrum existens*.

And as for *totum genericum existens*, it is nothing else (as I conceive) but *integrum simile*. For *genus* existeth not as *genus*, but only under distinct specificall forms, and is abstracted from the *Species* or individuals by the understanding. Now that which hath no existence of its own, can have no existing Officers. *Omne corporeum existens, vel est integrum, vel membrum.*

Neither will it help the cause at all to say, that *Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists*, were extraordinary temporary officers. First, here are ordinary Officers inserted also, given to the same Church, as *Teachers, ruling-Elders, Deacons*. Secondly, a *genus* admits of no variations in regard of time or place, or any other accidents: nothing extraordinary can betide a *genus*, but an *integrum* or existing being. *Genus, ut est æterna veritas, sic est æterna*

aeterna identitatis. Genus is abstractum quid, non concretum, but Sect. 4.
 the Church-Catholike is *concretum quid, & constans, & aggregatum ex membris, non ex speciebus*: as shall be shewed more fully afterwards.

His second Exposition is, that the *Apostle* points at one particular, but includeth all particulars, by a parity and proportion of reason.

Ans. This cannot be; for this Church here meant is the political body of Christ, as M. Hooker himself expounds it, as I shewed before. Now all the members of a particular Church (as suppose Corinth) are but *members of a part of that body*, as I shewed before.

Secondly, God did not set all these in every particular Church. Had every particular Congregation *Apostles, Prophets, miracles, gifts of healing, diversities of tongues?* yea, take the constant Officer, the teacher, and ordinarily, one Congregation hath, not teachers, but only one teacher: therefore this parity of reason cannot hold, except all these Officers were in the plural number in every Congregation. And if the Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, were Officers of every particular Congregation, *quâ* particular, then all those incongruities which our brethren bring against Presbyterial government; of choice, ordination, maintenance, honour, from the particular Congregations to them; and their constant teaching, watching over, and ruling of them, fall directly upon these Officers. I suppose many Congregations never had all these *kindes* of Officers among them. If it be meant distributively, some to one, some to another, then it should have been said *Churches*, not *Church*.

This place being a main fort that stood in M. Ellis's way, he laies his main battery against it: and gives many answers thereunto, which yet are not *subordinate* or *subserving* one to another, nor yet *consistent* one with another: but if any one will serve the turn to batter it down, it matters not (it seems) what become of the rest. He parallels this place with Eph. 4. 4, 5. And saith, that *one body* or *Church* here and there spoken of, is meant in the same sense that *One faith, One Baptism* is, *viz.* one in kinde: and as there are many single faiths, hopes, baptisms, though *one in kinde*, so there is *one body in kinde*,
 but

Chap. 2.

but many singular bodies. *vind. p. 34.* But M. Ellis might have seen, that if he had run his parallel a little further, he had run over shoes and boots too. For there it is said, that there is *One Spirit, one Lord Jesus, one God and Father*, not in kinde, but in number; and why may not the Church, in which there is one individual doctrine of faith, and body of laws, and into which there is one manner of introwment by baptism, and in which only there is hope of salvation, be one numerically also: especially considering that as the head, the Lord Jesus Christ, is one in number: so his body the Church can be but one in number also: For Christ hath not more bodies, in the same respect, then one.

But even his granting of a *mystical onenesse in Essence*, drives him to "grant Willingly, that this doth imply an union visible also, "as much as may stand with the institution of Christ, and the edification of the Church, p. 34. And I think the Presbyterians desire no more.

Also he saith, "the Church is one as the worship and government is one, viz. for nature and kinde, in the substantials of it, "or that general platform of it, *Mat. 18. &c.* but as the Church "is not one visible policy or corporation in number, so neither "in outward government of it, *vind. 35.*

Ans. The Presbyterians do acknowledge many distinct particular corporations of particular Churches, exercising government actually and constantly by their own Officers. But as this onenesse in kinde of worship and government, giveth every private Christian, whose constant actual exercise of publike worship is in one Congregation, an habitual right to worship God, and communicate in any (though never so far remote) Congregation, if occasion serve: and makes him liable to reproofs and suspension there: if there be known cause; why shall not the Officers also whose constant actual exercise is but in one Congregation, have the like priviledge to exercise their office in any remote Congregation upon an occasion, or call to it?

But there were two Objections *vind. p. 35.* which played so hard upon him, that they beat him from that battery, and therefore he betakes himself to another, mounted much higher.

"I grant

"I grant (saith he) the Apostle speaks of the Church, whether Sect. 4.
 "visible or invisible, universal or particular, but not of it in
 "these respects, but *mystically* and *totally*, as comprehending
 "those in heaven also, and this sense I will stick unto. pag. 35.
 "Now in this *body*, or this *Church*, as Eph. 3. 6. or in this fami-
 "ly in heaven and earth, *anvers. 15* He hath set some Apostles,
 "some Pastors. Though they have exercise of their functions
 "only, in that part which is on earth, and in that part of it
 "on earth which is visible: yet they are placed in the whole,
 pag. 36.

But here M. Ellis grants more then was desired. I fear this
 opinion will prove but a novel opinion: and he will have but
 few fellows to stand by him in managing this piece of battery.
 For as it expressly crosseth D. Ames before-cited, who saith,
 the Church-Catholike is one in regard of its external and acci-
 dental state, and not internal and essential: so it crosseth him-
 self, who holdeth that the Officers of a particular Church *are*
Officers only in their severall Churches, vind. p. 8, therefore not
 set in the Church Triumphant. Certainly there they are where
 they were set, but they are in the Church visible militant only:
 the Church Triumphant hath no Officers. This opinion will
 make all the Ministers notable *Non-residents*, who never come
 at the place where they were set, all their life time. It were a
 happy turn for the Ministers if they were all placed in the
 Church Triumphant as well as militant: I am sure many of them
 will never come there. The Saints in heaven have no hand in
 the election of Officers here below, which by his arguing they
 ought to have, as well as the Church-Catholike in the election
 of every particular Officer. *vind. p. 40.* The Church in heaven
 have neither word, Sacraments, nor discipline, which are count-
 ed the notes of the Church where the Ministry is placed. The
 Ministers preach not to them, pray not with them, have no ex-
 ternal communion with them, watch not over them, neither
 admonish nor rebuke them, nor perform any part of their mi-
 nisterial office to them. Nay, the Officers are not so much as
 placed in the *invisible Church* on earth: for as invisible it hath
 no Officers, but as visible only. It is true they are set for the
 good of the invisible Church, and for the perfecting of the
 G Triumphant,

Chap. 1. 2. Triumphant, but they are set only in the visible, and they are altogether visible, and many of them only visible, and yet are true Ministers. Are the gifts of tongues, and of healing, and Deacons, set in the whole Church Triumphant, as well as Militant?

Are all that are baptized into one body, baptized into the Triumphant as well as militant? I think you will not say so, But how are we flown from a particular, visible, congregational Church, to the Triumphant on a sudden, from one stream to another? Remember that of the Poet *No si dimissio ibis, Ulaa graves pinnae, si celsior, igni adurat, laet utrumque vola, addio tuissimum ibis.* It is clear the Apostle speaks of that body wherein is suffering, and rejoicing one with another. But Abraham is ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not.

It is contrary to reason itself, that the Officers reckoned up in 1 Cor. 12:28. and Eph. 4:11. should be set in the Church essentially taken; for discipline is not essential to the Church, but for the *bride's* as well as for the *bridegroom's*. Considering also that by those Officers the Church becometh political. It were a paradox to say that a King, Judges, Justices, and Sheriffs and Laws, &c. are given to a Kingdom essentially, and not as it is a police; for they are the very *formal* *ratio*, and *finis* of the police thereof; without which it might indeed have an essence, but no political. Our brethren for Congregational Churches hold that there may be a Church ontive or essential, before they choose any Officer, else they were in no capacity to choose them; how then can Officers agree to them essentially? But it is contrary to sense to say they are set in the Church Triumphant.

But fearing that he cannot keep this battery, he retires to a Third, and that is a double one. In the general he saith, "Should I grant (which I do not) that the Apostle is to be understood of the Church on earth, yet he speaks as well of a particular Church as of the general. And to avoid the defect of this Forron *dehinc* (as he saith) viz. 1 Cor. 12:28. He brings in two significations of the word *Apostle*: by which it is worth alone (saith he) is the ground of the Objection. And if saith, if we take the word for such Officers as were set out

with commission from any Church upon special occasion, Sect. 4.
 which is the literal signification of the word, and is so taken,
 1 Cor. 12.30 of *Barnabas*, and *Phil.* 2.25 of *Epaphroditus*,
 so the Archibishop here were voided.

Ans. But there is not the least probability that the Apostle
 in setting down the Officers of the Church, both extraordinary
 and ordinary, should set down occasional messengers first, before
 Prophets and Teachers.

And in *Ephes.* 4. 11. keeping the same Order, should pre-
 ferre them before Prophets, Evangelists, Pastours and Teachers.
 And leave out in both places the highest office in the Church,
 viz. Apostleship, especially considering that the Apostle there
 doth not set down the Officers *vapim*, promiscuously, but ad-
 deth an ordinal numeral with them, *first Apostles, secondarily*
Prophets.

But again, "If it be taken properly, in that he applyeth his
 speech particularly, though not exclusively, to the *Corinthi-
 ans*: ye are the body of Christ (to wit, ye are a particular
 body) and members in particular, and so Chap. 3. 21, 22. *All
 are yours, whether Paul or Apollos, or Cephas, or life or death,
 all are yours, and ye (Corinthians) Christ.* Where all are
 the whole Churches, and each Churches in particular, as their
 occasions require; each in their order (He might also have
 said, and each particular member.) So that the sense is (saith
 he) he hath given or set in the Church, &c. in this Church of
 Corinth, and so in that of *Ephesus*, &c. Some Apostles, &c.
 as their need shall require: yet not therefore making them
 one external society (among themselves) As some gene-
 ral Officers make not England and Scotland one King-
 dom.

Ans. M. Ellis goes upon a mistake in all his book. The
 Presbyterians say not that the Church Catholike visible is one
 external, constant, actual society, but *habitual*; or *in actu pri-
 mo*: or constantly and actually, *in actu secundo seu exercitio*,
 the regiment is exercised in the particular Churches or vicini-
 ties: yet hath the whole Church, or some great parts of it
 some common interests that may require to be handled in Sy-
 nodi and Councils, by their combined or delegated Officers

Chap. 2. §. 2

occasionally: and those Officers therein, act not as private men, but as Officers, and may exert their *indefinite habitual* power annexed to their office, for the good of the whole, or of so great a part of the Church-Catholike as did delegate them.

And as for the paralleling Apostles and Prophets in this case with life and death, it is not equal: for God did not set life and death as Officers in the Church, but they are general accidents to the whole world, over-ruled by God for the good of his people: *All things work together for the good of them that love him.*

But in that he grants the word *Church* to extend to *Corinthians* and *Ephesians*, &c. he must grant it to comprehend all the Churches as well as them, and that they all are one Church habitually, having then some general Officers over them, viz. Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists and Teachers, and the same Apostle, the same Prophet, and the same Teacher (if need required) in any of them.

But fearing he could not keep that battery, he retreats to a fourth, and saith, "that though by *Church* were meant the "Church-Catholike visible, yet it follows not that because "it was so then, and in respect of the Apostles, that therefore "it was to be so to the end of the world, and in it self.

Ans. It is true, it was not Christs minde that the extraordinary office of Apostleship should continue, there were to be no more such men of extraordinary gifts, and divine immediate mission, of an infallible spirit, that had actual regiment over the Churches of the whole world, without any delegation from others, but by immediate commission from Christ. But how comes that which was an *integral* in the Apostles daies, to be now sublimated into a *genus*, and lose the integrality, and so prove a second notion, existing only in *intellectu nostro*? Did it cease to be one body as soon as the Apostles were all dead? seeing the same doctrine, worship, laws, discipline, enrowment by baptism, confirmation and communion in the Lords Supper continued still: and the liberty of all the members of the whole Church to communicate in these, in any place of the world,

world, where they become (though but occasionally) contri- Sect. 4.
nue still. And by the same reason the habitual power *in actu*
primo which the Officers have to dispense the Ordinances of
God, may be drawn forth in any part of the Church, in *actu*
secundum, upon an occasion and call, according to their measure;
which the Apostles had habitually and actually, every where,
both in *actu primo & secundo*, extraordinarily.

Yes, but (saith he) the Churches were not one in them-
selves, but one in the Apostles, and that by accident, as *England*
and *Scotland* were one in the King, because he governed both;
Israel and *Judah* in *David*: the whole world one in *Nebuchad-*
rezzar. But they are not therefore one, considered in them-
selves. *Vind. p. 37.*

Ans. I grant, the Church was but accidentally and tempor-
rarily one in regard of the Apostles, but integrally one in-it self.
It was not one, because that *they* were set over it, but it was
one in-it self integrally, because Christ is set over it, and there-
fore they by commission from Christ, were set over it extraor-
dinarily; for the present good and necessity thereof. An Em-
pire being made one under one Emperour, hath imperial laws
and constitutions, which being divided under divers governours
it loseth again, and ceaseth to be an Empire, but the Church hath
the same laws under the same head that it had then, and ever
shall have. The world was one Empire under *Darius* by im-
perial laws, not because the three Presidents were set o-
ver it, neither did it cease to be so by their death or ceasing.
So &c.

But fifthly, saith he, though we grant, that while the Apo-
stles were living, there was one body of Officers over the whole
Church, and so in respect of them the Church might be said
to be one governed body, yet it was never one governing body:
for whilst the Apostles lived, the universal governing power
was committed to the Apostles only, and not with them to
any other Officers or Churches; no not to all the Churches
together, but they with their Officers were all in subjection to
them.

Ans. I acknowledge the Church-Catholike was never one
governing body; although M. *Ellis* is pleased to set down that

Chap. 2. expression in capital letters, in the frontispiece of his book, and upon the top of every page, and in divers other places, as the opinion of the Presbyterians. But where doth he finde any such expression in their writings? It may more truly be affirmed to be the opinion of some of our brethren of the Congregational way, who put government into the body of the Congregation (whether M. Ellis be of that opinion or no, I cannot say) and so they are a particular governing body, and if all the Churches in the world were of that way (as certainly they desire) and these Churches might in any sense be called one Church (as is confessed by all that they may) then they must needs be one governing body. But as they are now, they not only govern their own body, but passe the censure of *Non-communication* against all persons, nay whole Churches, if they judge there be cause.

But the Presbyterians hold that governments belong to the Organs, i.e. the Officers of the Church, not to the body. It is for good of the body, but belongs not to the body to exercise. The Church-Catholike is the subject *in quo exercetur*, or *qui datur*, *non ad utendum, sed ad fruendum*.

Neither are the Officers of the Church-Catholike one constant collective governing body actually, but habitually; for constantly and actually they are distributed into several Congregations for the exercise of government there. But if the necessity of the whole (when it could be) or of any great part of the body, call the Officers of many particular Churches together (which may be by themselves or their Commissioners) then can they exercise their office collectively *conjunctim*, yet only according to the word of God. And this M. Ellis granteth in effect p. 78. only he saith their power being met, is only consultatory and suatory, not obligatory: it is the acting of officers, but not as Officers: but I suppose he cannot think, that consultatory and suatory power, is sufficient to cure the Church of the malady of obstinate hereticks, whose mouths (saith the Apostle) must be stopped. And though the universal, constant, actual power of government was given to the Apostles only, yet we see they did joyn with the particular Elders in the government of their Churches, when they were among them: and did also

also joyn them with themselves in making decrees to binde the Churches. *Act. 15. 6. and Act. 16. 4.* Sec. 4. d.

But fearing lest he had granted something too much in his former answer, he plucks away part of it in his fixt, and saith, that the *Apostles were not one joint Ministry*. For besides that each had intire power; some had one part committed to them, and some another, *Thomas sortum est Parthiam, Andream Scythiam, Iohannes Aham, &c.*

Ans. The Apostles did first act in *Jerusalem* as one joint combined ministry: and did afterward disperse themselves into several parts of the world, according to their commission, yet retained their power of uniting and acting together jointly without any delegation or commission from any Churches, and this power of theirs no ordinary Ministers lay claim to. And though the planting and watering of Churches required this dispersion, and several lots voluntarily, yet were they fixed in no Congregation, as Elders are.

Seventhly, He denyeth the consequence of a Church-Catholic-like visible, from that place, and that he proves by a parallel, supposing such like words had been said of the whole world for civil government: his words are these; If it follow not, when we say God hath set in the world, some Emperors, some Kings, some Princes, some inferiour Officers and Magistrates, therefore the world is but one governing Kingdom, and all particular Kingdoms do but govern in the right of the Kingdom of the world in common; the Officers whereof are the Kings of the several Kingdoms, &c. Neither doth it follow, that because the Scripture saith, God hath set some in the Church, Apostles, &c. therefore the Church throughout the world is but one Congregation, to whose Officers first, as the general Officers of the whole Church, not by way of distribution, but as a notionally (at least) collected body of Officers, the power of government is committed, &c.

He hath not paralleled the question rightly, but it should run thus, Suppose there were one Emperour over all the Kingdoms of the earth, and he should set down one form of government and enrolment for freedom in the whole world, for such as will be his subjects, and should first set a
Presidents

Chap. 2.

Presidents over the whole world, to abide so for their life time, as extraordinary Officers, and for ordinary standing Officers, should set in the several Provinces or Kingdoms, several Officers that should rule under him or them, in their several places: and yet appoint, that as every free member of the whole, though his fixed habitation be in one place, yet is free of the whole habitually, and upon occasion can make use of it, to trade freely in any place: so the several governours, though ordinarily, fixedly and actually, they constantly govern their own Provinces, yet upon occasion of difference, danger, or for the good of the whole, or any great part of the same, they shall have power to convene, either all, if it may be, or some of them by way of delegation, to act for the good of the whole, or so many Provinces as the matter concerns, and their delegation is for. Whether would not this prove the world one intire Empire, and body politic habitually? And so is the case of the Church-Catholike.

But take earthly monarchies as they have been on earth, and we finde that the several kingdoms of the Empires did enjoy their several liberties, with respect had to the whole, that nothing should be prejudicial to the Empire, that the Emperour *should have no damage*, Dan. 6. 2. And yet in reference to the Emperour, and some certain common laws, they were one monarchy. Because the Emperour could send messengers and Officers of any countrey, and commands to them all, and all were to take care in their places for the whole (though haply there was no general convention of all Officers) and to keep as much as lay in them neighbour Kingdoms from rebelling, even where they had no ordinary jurisdiction, and to subdue them to the Emperour if they did rebel, and yet not retain ordinary power over them. Now these things agree to this spiritual monarchy the Church; yea, and much more. For they are all one in the head, one in all the laws, and in one form of government; and ought all to do what they do in reference to the whole; as to admit every where into the whole by baptism, to eject out of the whole by excommunication, to keep any neighbour Church from defection, and to reduce them if fallen off, though they have no ordinary jurisdiction over them.

Christ

Christ can send a Minister out of any Kingdom into any, not Sect. 4. only occasionally, *pro tempore*, as a messenger, but settle him there as an Officer, and call back or remove him any whither else. And therefore the Church-Catholike is one Kingdom in general, and yet particular rights and liberties of particular Churches be preserved, so far as may stand with the good of the whole.

There is one Objection which M. Hooker in *Surv. c. 15 p. 273.* hath against this proof in this text, which is of some difficulty, *viz.* That Church where Deacons are set is not an unlimited Church: But ordinary Deacons were set in the same Church wherein the Apostles were set, as in the place, 1 *Corinth. 12.* it is affirmed jointly and indifferently of them both. Therefore that Church doth not argue an unlimited power.

Ans. It is not affirmed that the Church-Catholike hath an unlimited power, but unlimited extent of the power given them by Christ, in regard of place within the compasse of the Christian world; and so I conceive M. Hookers meaning is.

But to the Objection it self, First I premise, that Deacons were not primarily set in a particular Congregational Church, but 7 of them were at the first institution of the office set in the Church of *Jerusalem* over Jews and Grecians, where there were many Congregations, and therefore a Classial, Presbyterian Church divided into many Congregations necessarily, at least for some Ordinances (as the Lords Supper, &c.) yet governed by one common Presbytery, and yet alwaies called one Church. But whether their Officers were fixed in the several Congregations or no, I know not, neither do I think it can be proved.

Secondly, The subject about which their office was exercised, was not the Ordinances of worship or discipline, as the other offices were, but about alms, which in their own nature are or ought to be, and were then, voluntary. And in regard those alms come not by divine dispensation, as the immediate gift of Christ to the Church, though they be commanded indeed by Christ, but out of mens purses by contribution, being a money

Chap. 2.

matter, in which the Congregation hath, or had propriety, there may be something said for the limitation of that office in their act of ordinary distribution to the members of that single or combined Church contributing, that it may be performed according to the will of the donors, to whom also the Deacons are to render an account.

Thirdly, I desire the manner of the Apostles speech in setting down Deacons and governours, may be considered, not adding an ordinal numeral unto it, as to Apostles, Prophets and Teachers, but *eternum* and *etiam deinde*: and 2^d. interposing 2 extraordinary endowments of miracles, and gifts of healing: and 3. the change of speech from the concrete to the abstract, *helps, governments*. Which though they imply men by whom they are to be exercised, *via*. helpers and governours, yet are not so set down: what the meaning of the holy Ghost is herein I cannot affirm, but I conceive that the office of Apostles, Prophets, Teachers, is of somewhat more large extent than the other two, because they were executed as well without the Church (though set in it) as within it, *via*. among heathens for their conversion: And in *Ecclesia constituenda*, the other in *constituta* only: and the exerting of the Deacons office not so usually and frequently out of the limits of their particular Churches, as theirs that are intrusted with the preaching of the word: nor yet their call thereunto so facil as the others: for to the exerting of government there is required a voluntary combination of many instituted Churches, and for distribution to other Churches there is required a more than ordinary necessity, and the consent of the particular Church contributing: but no such solemn call is required to the preaching the word in any other Church or Churches.

But fourthly, more directly to the Objection: Though alms, which is the subject of the Deacons office, be not reckoned among the Ordinances given by Christ, but are the gift of particular men in particular Congregations, as the rest of them: yet the necessity, command, and distribution of them, may extend further than the particular Church, and in that regard the office of Deacons, which is to collect and distribute, extends it self equally. We are bidden to *do good to all, but especially*

pecially to the household of faith (i. e. as we have occasion and Sect. 5. ability) which is as extensive as the Church-Catholike. Any forreign Church may stand in need of our contribution and distribution. And even the Law of our land enjoyneth, that if any Congregation cannot maintain their poor, there should be help by collections from other neighbouring Congregations. And the maimed souldiers of the whole County are maintained by constant collection from every town in the County, and there are County Treasurers that receive it, which are (as it were) County-Deacons. And if a great Town be visited with the plague, or suffer losses by fire, &c. it is frequent to make collections for them in many Counties. Yea, for whole Counties, as the whole Kingdom, hath lately done for *Lancashire*; yea, for a whole Kingdom, as for our own Kingdom under war; yea, for forreign Kingdoms, as *England*, yea, and the *Netherlands* (though under another civil regiment) have done for *Ireland*. And we reade what the Churches of *Asia* did for the Churches of *Jerusalem*. And we have had contribution to redeem captivated Christians under the *Turk*, and not only of our own Nation, but other Nations, sometimes *Grecians*. Now though these contributions and collections run among us in another channel, viz. through the hands of Church-wardens, Overseers, Constables, Collectors, yet this is the proper work of the Deacons; and therefore that office in regard of the extent of their possible object, may well be said to be habitually Catholike, or given to the Church-Catholike, though their constant distribution should be limited to their own Congregations.

Another proof is from 1 Tim. 3. 15. *These things I write unto thee, that thou maist know how thou oughtest to behave thy self in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.* This Church must be the visible Church where he and others must exist, and converse together, and carry themselves in mutual duties. Also it must be an organical Church, for the Epistle containeth directions about Bishops and Deacons, yea, even in the context. Neither can the directions be solely concerning *Ephesus*; for they are written to *Timothy* an Evangelist, the limits of whose office are commensurable to the Apostles, though under them. Neither do they

Chap. 2.

concern Ephesus in any especially manner, but all Churches where ever *Timothy* should come. Therefore not to it particularly. For he prescribeth canons concerning publike praier: and the habit and carriage of women in the Church: concerning the office of Bishops and Deacons: concerning the censuring and reproof of all degrees; the Ordination and maintenance of Elders: the choice and provision for widows: concerning the duties of servants: and a charge to rich men, not of *Ephesus* particularly or only, but every where. Neither did they concern *Ephesus* primarily; for the Officers were already set in that Church; *Paul* found Elders there *Act. 20.17.* in his visitation of them, and had lived there three years, *vers. 31.* as himself acknowledgeth. Primarily therefore these canons concern the whole Church. The manner also of the Apostles speech is to be attended; he doth not say *the Churches, houses, pillars, grounds*, to be ordered *parvaton*; but in the singular number *house, church, pillar, ground*, *οἶκος ἐκκλησία*, as if there were but *one Church, one house* (whereof *Ephesus* was but *one room*, and that already furnished) *one seat, one large pillar*, that hath the same truth written on every side of it, which holdeth it forth unto others, both Jews and Gentiles, within the Church and without, *more forensi*. And as *Timothy* being an Evangelist conversed with many Churches, so it is like did the members of the Church of *Ephesus*. *The English Annotations on this place are these.* "As the Catholike Church is, as it were, the whole house of God; so every particular Church as this of *Ephesus* was, in which *Timothy* resided, was a part thereof, and by a Synecdoche (*totius*) may be called the house of God, &c. The words also of the following verse will lend us some light, *Great is the mystery of godliness: God manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.* This is the truth supported by this seat, and holden forth by this pillar. Doth this concern *Ephesus* solely, or particularly, or primarily? Is there not a larger subject expressed, *viz.* Gentiles and the believing world? All these are the family and household of God, *Eph. 2.19.* and *3.15.*

Again, it is the Catholike visible Church that is so often in
Scripture

Scripture called the *Kingdom of God*, Mat. 4. 26, 30. And the Sect. 5. *Kingdom of heaven*, Mat. 13. 24, 31, 33, 47. Christ calls them not Kingdoms but the Kingdom. And compares this Kingdom to a *field of wheat mingled with tares*. This must be the Church visible in this world, because it is where the sower ordinarily soweth his seed visibly and audibly, *vers. 8.* which is the preaching of the word. And because here are good and bad, wheat and tares, and the tares visibly discerned after the wheat. And it is the Catholike Church, for Christ himself expounds it so, *the field is the world*, not of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also, *Job. 3. 16.* and *17. 11, 15.* And this must be the Christian world; for the other is a field of tares only, where there could be no danger of plucking up of wheat, because none grew there. They shall sever the wicked from among the just. And in this field, particular Churches are but as particular ridges, enjoying the same tillage, seed, fencing, watering. *It is a barn floor with wheat and chaffe. It is a draw net, gathering together good and bad. It is a marriage, where wise and foolish virgins, some had oil, and some only lamps of profession. It is a feast where some had wedding garments, some had none.* Now these things cannot be spoken solely, or primarily of any particular Congregation, but they agree to the Church-Catholike visible, this Kingdom is here spoken of as one; and to particular Churches as parts thereof: and this is also an organical body, therefore called a Kingdom. Here are servants sowing and viewing this field, proffering to weed it. And this weeding must be by Ecclesiastical censures, not the civil sword; they were not so void of reason as to go ask whether they should kill all the world besides the godly, with a civil sword: then these tares must be members of the Church, else they were not capable to be cast out, if never in. Here were fishermen (officers) that cast this net: and servants that invited these guests, every where in high waies and hedges, *Luk. 14. 23.* indefinitely, without respect of Countrey or Town.

That which is objected against this by M. Hooker is, "that the *Kingdom of heaven* beside other significations, as the Kingdom of glory, &c. it doth by a *metonymy* imply the word of the Kingdom, and the dispensation and administration

Chap. 2.

"of the Gospel in the Churches, and the special things appertaining thereunto. And citeth these parables for that sense.

Ans. I deny not the several significations of those words, *the Kingdom of heaven*, in several places. But they cannot signify so in the fore-cited places. For it is said, *the Angels shall gather out of his (Christs) Kingdom, all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them, &c.* can this be meant of the word or Gospel? Is there any thing that offends therein, or doth iniquity that shall be cast, &c.? Is there any tares, any chaff, any rubbish there? Or can it be meant of the dispensation thereof? Should sinful or erroneous dispensations of Gods Ordinances be suffered to the end of the world, for fear of plucking up good dispensations? Why do we then endeavour a reformation? Doth not *Paul* say false teachers mouths must be stopped, and wisheth such cut off?

It is clear the texts speak of a Kingdom consisting of persons, the tares, chaffe, rubbish, foolish virgins, and evil guests, are the children of the wicked one, men that offend, and doe iniquity, that shall be gathered out of Christs Kingdom, therefore they were in it. And the wheat, good fish, wise virgins, and good guests, are the children of the Kingdom, without respect to any particularities, of Town or Countrey, much lesse of any Congregation.

And when we say, *Thy Kingdom come*, we pray not only for the conversion of the elect, nor only for the coming of the Kingdom of glory, but also for the Church-Catholike visible, that it might be enlarged, and have freedom and purity of Ordinances, which are things that concern it as a visible, organical Kingdom, because the dispensations thereof are by Officers.

Again in 1 Cor. 15. 24. it is said, *Then shall Christ deliver up the Kingdom to God his Father.* This is not the natural or essential Kingdom, which he hath with the Father and holy Ghost as God: for that he shall never deliver up. Neither is it the Kingdom of grace which he by his Spirit exerciseth in the hearts of the Elect, for that shall continue for ever, and be more perfect in heaven. For the Kingdom of grace here, and of glory afterward,

afterward, differ only *gradus communionis*, as *Ames* tells us; Sect. 5. here the degree is imperfect, then it shall be perfect, both in graces and joyes. But it is the Kingdom exercised in the visible Church-Catholike, in the Ordinances of worship and discipline, wherein our communion is mediate with God, which shall then cease. For as the Evangelical external service and manner of communion with God, thrust out the legal and ceremonial: so shall the heavenly immediate, thrust out the Evangelical.

But this Kingdom (saith *M. Hooker*) cannot be the Catholike visible Church, because that consisting of sound-hearted Christians and false-hearted hypocrites, these are not delivered up into the hand of the Father, that he might be all in all to them. *Surv. p. 176.*

Ans. I do not conceive by Kingdom to be meant the children of the Kingdom, but the external donative regiment of Christ over his visible Church-Catholike dispensed by Ordinances and Officers here below, which shall then cease. And "though the Ordinances (as he alledgech) are distinct from "the Kingdom in sense and signification. Yet they strongly argue a Kingdom constituted and governed by them: as the Kings laws argue a King and Kingdom. As from *helps and governments*, 1 Cor. 12.28. we gather the consequence of *helpers and governors*, as officers in the Church: so from the external laws of this Kingdom, we necessarily conclude there is such a Kingdom, commensurable to the extent of these laws, and that external, Organical and Catholike, which is spoken of 1/a. 9.6. And the 25. ver. makes it plain, *for he must reign until he hath put all enemies under his feet*: which reigning relates to professed Subjects as well as professed enemies; and these Subjects comprehended in a Kingdom.

Again Heb. 12.28. *Wherefore we receiving a Kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear.* This Kingdom cannot be meant of the internal Kingdom of grace in the heart, for that was also exercised by Christ in his peoples hearts, under the old Testament, but it is meant of the external, unalterable, perpetual Ordinances of worship and government, which differ-

Chap. 2.

ed from those under the Law: else the Apostles *antithesis* of the Church under the Law, and the Church under the Gospel, had not been good, which are the things he compares in that place. Externals under the Law are opposed to externals under the Gospel. It cannot be meant of the *Kingdom of glory*, for they had not yet received that. And it is plain he speaks of a Kingdom wherein we may now serve God acceptably, *With reverence and godly fear*. Now these Ordinances of worship and discipline being Catholike or universal, and relating to a Kingdom, and therefore set down under the name of a kingdom, by a *Metonymy* of the *subject* for the *adjunct*, the Kingdom for the Ordinances of the Kingdom, do strongly argue the being of the Kingdom. Can we conceive that the holy Ghost would chuse to use such a *metonymy* of the *subject*, where there is *no such subject*? It is true (as is alledged) the unalterableness lyeth in the adjunct Ordinances, *i. e.* in regard of God, who will not alter them: and that the subject or kingdom may be moved and shaken by persecutions or heresies, and so may the Ordinances also, and have been we know; but that kinde of alteration, moving, or shaking, is not meant in the text, neither was intended by me. I have the rather mentioned this text, because I finde one of our brethren for Congregational Churches, *viz.* M. William Sedgwick, giving this Exposition of it in a Sermon of his in print, which was preached before divers members of the House of Commons.

Sect. 6.

Again 1 Cor. 5. 12. The Apostle saith, *what have I to doe to judge those that are without?* The preposition or adverb *ἔξω*, I desire to know what it doth relate unto, Is it not meant *ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, without the Church? And can we think that that Church was the Church of *Corinth* only? Had *Paul* nothing to do to judge any that were out of the Church of *Corinth*, when he was an Apostle all over the Christian world? This could not be meant of the *invisible* company only: what? had *Paul* nothing to do to censure any but invisible members? Why did he then excommunicate *Hymenaeus*, *Philetus*, *Phigellus*, *Hermogenes* and *Alexander*? And saith, I would they were cut off that trouble you. Also it must be meant of an Organical body, because here are censures mentioned as belonging to all within.

And

And therefore it must be meant of the Church-Catholike visible Sect. 6.
Organical : What have I to do to judge those that are not brought into the Church? They are not under my power or cognizance, but belong only to the civil Magistrate.

And we usually speak of the Countreys that are within the *Pale of the Church*, and those that are without. And we have an axiome, *Extra Ecclesiam non est salus*; which cannot be meant of any particular Congregation in the world, but is true of the Church-Catholike visible, typified by the *Ark of Noah*, without which ordinarily and visibly there is no hope of salvation. *Extra ejus gremium non est speranda peccatorum remissio.* Calv. Inst. 4. c. 1. S. 4.

Again, *Eph. 4. 4. 5.* The Apostle proveth the Church to be but one by divers Arguments, First, saith he, *There is one body of Christ*, which is therefore called, *Eph. 3. 6.* *Σύσσωμα*, both of Jews and Gentiles, i. e. the same body. And this an Organical body, because *Paul* addeth, *ver. 7.* whereof I was made a Minister. Secondly, *there is but one spirit* in that whole body, which is as one soul in one body. Thirdly, there is but *one hope of their calling*. Fourthly, There is but *one Lord*, or King over the whole Church. Fifthly, There is but *one faith*, i. e. One religion, doctrine, worship, the same Commands and Statutes for all. Sixthly, There is but *one Baptism*, to admit into this Church. Now if the whole world were under one King, and governed by one Law, and all one body, and all capable of the same priviledges, and all made Denizons by the same way of enrowlment, it would make but one Empire; yet so it is with all the Christians and Churches in the world; they have the same King, Law, Word, Sacraments of admission and nutrition, which they visibly subject themselves unto and receive, therefore they are all one visibly Church. Upon this text, *ver. 12.* *Beza* in his *large Annotations* hath this note. "Being the Church is to be considered, either as a *Communnality of a sacred Commonwealth*, or as a *spiritual Temple*, or as a *mystical body*, the mystery of the word ought likewise to be referred to these three heads, &c. All which 3. considerations shew the unity and integrality of the whole.

And that this is meant of the visible Church, and not invisible

Chap. 2.

visible or Triumphant, as M. Ellis conceiveth, appeareth, because it is the Church to whom Officers are given, *ver. 11.* to be edified, *ver. 12, 13.* compacted together by joints, *ver. 16.* of whom mutual duties both religious and civil are required, for such are set down in that Chapter, and the following. And so M. Hooker understands it, *Serv. p. 3.* where he cites this text for the political body or Church visible of Christ, ruled by the donative, delegated power of Christ, and that visibly by his Ordinances and officers. It is therefore the militant visible Church which holdeth forth the truth, *Phil. 2. 16.* contending for it, *Jude 3.* Into which the thief may possibly enter. *Joh. 10. Ath. 20. 29, 30.*

Again Christ saith, *Mat. 16. 18. On this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* Was this a particular Congregation? No surely, but the Church Catholike, for any particular Church may be prevailed against, but the whole shall not, The place is meant of a Church future, to be built, which Christ then intended to set up, which was the Evangelical Catholike Church, consisting of Jews and Gentiles as one body, and not Catholike (as some take it) for the Church past, present, and to come, for those already in heaven are out of gunne-shot of assault, but it is meant *de Ecclesia vivorum, de militante, de Ecclesia quam Christus erat edificaturus.*

Object. O but this place is meant only of the Church invisible, for they that are only visible may be prevailed against?

Answ. It is true, that any particular meerly visible member may be prevailed against, yet all shall not; and even the invisible members which cannot be prevailed against (so many as are left in any, though never so general and fierce persecution) shall remain as visible. For *Ecclesia nunquam desinit esse visibilis.* Therefore Satan or men shall never so far prevail, as to cut off all visible members. And though heresies should come that deceive all but the elect (which is not supposable) yet as long as the Elect are not deceived, there remaineth a Church Catholike visible, still in their visibility. But it cannot be affirmed that all are invisible members that are left, or hold out

out in the hottest persecutions, or subtlest heresies: strong en- lightnings and convictions, and struglings of conscience, and other by-ends may do much. Latent members may not be invi- sible. Sc. 6.

But the reasons which induce me to think that this text is meant of the Church visible, are these; two I finde in the con- text. First, because this Church is built upon this visible or au- dible profession, *that Christ is the sonne of God*, which *Peter* made; The rock there spoken of, is not an indefinite *Messiah* to come, for so the Church from the beginning of the world was built on that work: but the profession and doctrine that the *Messiah is already come*, that this *Jesus* is the *Messiah*, and this *Jesus* the *Messiah* is the sonne of God. It is the con- fessing that *Jesus Christ is come in the flesh*, 1 Joh. 4. 2, 3. And the beleeving that I am he (saith Christ) Joh. 8. 24. And therefore the Jews that believed before in an indefinite *Messiah* to come, were upon their conversion to the Christian faith built upon this rock, and by a new Sacrament admitted into this Christi- an Church, as well as the Gentiles.

Secondly, Because Christ immediatly in the next verse affixeth officers to this Church, by promising the keys of the Kingdom of heaven unto *Peter* (and not to him only but to the rest also, as appears in other places) which keys are an Ensign of office in that Church which Christ would build.

Thirdly, Because the admission into this Evangelical Church was upon a visible profession of their belief of this doctrine, and a visible receiving of a visible external badg of bap- tisme.

Fourthly, Because this Church is assaulted by visible adver- saries, *viz.* persecutors and hereticks, and that visibly: and though they shall never wholly prevail against it, yet visibly waste great part of it many times.

And M. Hooker himself acknowledgeth that he doth incline to this judgement of this text, *viz.* that it is the visible Church that is there meant. *Surv. c. 15. p. 278.*

Only he objecteth against a reason which I brought of it, which was to this purpose. If all the visible members should fail, then all the invisible must needs fail also, for none are in- visible

Chap. 2.

visible (in the Church I mean) but must be visible also. His Objection against this is, because an invisible member may be justly excommunicated, and so cast out of all the visible Churches in the world, and so be no visible member, and yet remain an invisible member still, for that membership cannot be lost.

Ans. It is very doubtful to me how far excommunication casteth a man out of the visible Church; it debars him indeed from the Lords Supper, because it is a seal; and from familiar intimate society with Gods people, because he is an infected member, and so doth a notorious sinne, though the man be not excommunicated. But I conceive it cuts him not off totally from the visible Church; For first, the seal of baptism remaineth on him, and therefore is not iterated at his readmission. Secondly, he is admitted to hearing the word, and prayer, and conference with Gods people. He is a diseased leprous member under censure, shut from the most intimate actual communion, until he be cured and cleansed. That which is done to him is under consideration of discipline, as to a member now diseased, in order to cure, not as to one that is damned, or to one that is under the sinne against the holy Ghost, as *Julian* the Apostate was. And if any godly person through weaknesse of judgement concerning Churches not rightly gathered, refuse to be baptized (as *M. Hooker* suggesteth) he is indeed no compleat member in that regard, but he being converted by visible means, and making visible profession, he is an incomplete visible member of the Church-Catholike Entitive.

Again, Excommunication in 3 Ep. *Job.* ver. 10. is called *casting out of the Church*, What Church is that? It cannot be the invisible Church, for all the censures in the world cannot cast a man out of that, if once he be in; therefore it is the visible Church. Then I would know whether a man truly excommunicated in one Church or Congregation, is not thereby excommunicated from brotherly fellowship with all Congregations, yea, and Christians not gathered yet into Congregations? Or whether the delivering up to Satan, by the Officers of a particular Congregation, be only within the bounds of one Congregation, or in reference to their members only;

so that if he remove out of such a circle or circuit of ground Sect. 6.
to another, or from those members to others, he be out
of Satans bonds again, and may communicate there *de*
jure?

"This M. Hooker saith, is *per Synecdochen generis pro Specie*,
"that particular Church where *Diotrephes* usurped prehemi-
"nence is understood. For when a person is justly excommu-
"nicated from the Congregation in which he was, it follows
"of necessity that all that fellowship he might enjoy by ver-
"tue of communion of Churches, must of that necessity be de-
"nied unto him, and he justly deprived thereof, because in the
"vertue of his fellowship with one, he gained fellowship with
"others.

Ans. Whether the word *Church* be there properly, or *per*
Synecdochen generis, or *Synecdochen Integri*, I shall not now
enquire but refer it to a Chapter by it self, in which shall be
enquired whether the Church-Catholike be a *genus* or *integrum*.
But I question much whether a mans fellowship with one Con-
gregation be the ground whereby he gaineth fellowship and
communion with others. For then how came the Apostles and
Evangelists by right of communion with any Churches, seeing
they were fixed members of none? And how could the 120.
and 3000. converted by *Peter* have right of communion, and
breaking bread together, before any Congregations were set
up or settled? Therefore I conceive the primary right to com-
munion is gained by being of the visible body, not by being of
this or that Congregation, By being within the general Cove-
nant, not by any particular Covenant. And I conceive, that
Baptism and Excommunication run parallel herein; for as by
Baptism a man is admitted externally into the whole visible
body, and then may have fellowship with any part of the bo-
dy: so by Excommunication a man is cast out from commu-
nion with the whole, and therefore may communicate with no
part. This is *Apollonius* his assertion. *Sicut per Excommuni-*
cationem legitimam excommunicatus non tantum ex hac vel illa
particulari Ecclesia ejicitur, sed ubicunque terrarum ligatur, &
ex communione fraternâ universalis Ecclesie excluditur. Mat.
18.17,18. Ita & per Sacramentum Baptismi, & sacra Eucha-
ristia,

Chap. 3.

ristia, homini communio Ecclesiastica, non tantum in particulari, sed & universali Ecclesiâ obsequatur. Confid. quarund. contro. c.2. Art.3.

And though the power of Excommunication lyeth in the particular Congregation, where a person enjoies his membership under the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, as *M. Hooker* saith, yet the Officers of that particular Church dispense that censure in reference to the whole body, whereof he that is so censured was a member, as well as of that Congregation, for being cast out of that, let him be or go where he will, he is under the Kingdom of Satan, and all Churches should look at him as a Traitor against Christ, and so deal with him as one incapable of Church-communion. *Surv. c.15.*

So on the contrary, though Baptism be administred in a particular Congregation, yet a man so admitted in any Congregation, ought to be counted a subject to Christ, and not to be denied fellowship in any other Congregation, being a member of the visible body, except he some way forfeit his right. So that both admission into, and ejection out of the Church, though performed by Officers in a particular Congregation, yet relate first to the whole body.

CHAP. III.

Proofs by Arguments and Reason that there is a Church-Catholike visible.

Sect. 1.

THe first Argument is from Gods donation unto Christ, and it stands thus. If the donation of a Kingdom by God the Father unto Jesus Christ be universal and Oecumenical, then his Kingdom (which is his Church) is also universal and Oecumenical. But the donation was of an universal Oecumenical Kingdom: Therefore there is such an universal Oecumenical Kingdom or Church.

The major proposition is clear: for whatsoever God the Father gave or promised unto Jesus Christ, that he performed. The

minor

minor or assumption is proved out of divers places of Scripture. Sect. 6.

As *Psa. 2. 8.* Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession. Which is spoken of the donative Kingdome of Christ given to him at his asking, and not the essential or natural Kingdom as God, *Psal. 72. 8.* He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. Where is mentioned the external worship and offerings given unto him. The like promise we finde *Isa. 49. 6.* It is a light thing that thou shouldest raise up the Tribes of Iacob, I will give thee for a light unto the Gentiles, that thou maist be my salvation to the ends of the earth. Also *Dan. 7. 14.* And there was given unto him (Christ) dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him, his dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his Kingdom that which shall not be destroyed: Which is meant of the donative Kingdom given to Christ incarnate at his ascension, answering to *Eph. 4. 8.* where the officers of his Kingdom are set down. And to *Phil. 2. 9.* This is not only the internal Kingdom in the heart, for that he exercised from the beginning, but also an external Kingdom, or Church-politie over all nations, after the ruine of the four Monarchies, which should be exercised over those Kingdoms which formerly were subject to those Monarchies: which Kingdom is that little stone cut out of the mountain without hands, which became a great mountain and filled the whole earth, which the God of heaven should set up visibly in the stead of those Monarchies. *Dan. 2. 44.* not in a civil power of this world, but in spiritual and divine Ordinances, which all Kingdoms that should be converted to the Christian faith should submit themselves unto. And this one mountain filling the whole earth, must needs be one Church-Catholike visible, submitting visibly to Christ. 2. If Gods intention in sending Christ, and the tenour of Gods donation, and exhibition of Christ, and redemption by Christ in his revealed will, be general to the whole world, then the visible Church is to be Catholike. But the former is true, and therefore so is the latter. I mean by general, *Generibus singulorum, non singulis generum.*

The donation of Christ and redemption by him was not to the

Chap. 3.

the Jews only (as the Jews conceived) but to the whole world. *Joh. 1. 29. Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sinnes of the world. Joh. 3. 16. God so loved the world (not the Jews only) that he gave his only begotten sonne, that whosoever beleeveth in him should not perish but have everlasting life, i.e. that whosoever in any part of the world, of what nation soever, should beleve, should have everlasting life, That the world through him might be saved, vers. 17.* The Antithesis is not between the elect and reprobate, that whosoever of the elect beleve, as the *Arminians* make our sense of the words to runne ridiculously (though I confesse the elect only do truly beleve) but it is between the Jew and the rest of the world. So *Joh. 4. 42. Joh. 6. 33. 51. 2 Cor. 5. 19. 1 Joh. 2. 2. a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, 1 Joh. 4. 14. The Saviour of the world.*

Now though many of the benefits purchased by Christ for his elect be spiritual and invisible, and obtained only by the invisible company, yet Christ himself and his death were visible, his righteousness visibly performed, his active and passive obedience were visible, and multitude of benefits that the external Catholike Church receive thereby are visible.

3. If the Gospel of the Kingdom, the seed and means of converting and bringing in (not only of the invisible company, but) the visible Church, be Catholike, and universally preached and received, then the Church so converted and visibly brought in, is Catholike also. But the Gospel is a general gift, and is scattered like seed indefinitely in all the world, and worketh a visible conversion of the whole world, in Scripture phrase. Therefore the Church is Catholike also. The major is clear of it self. The minor is proved *Mat. 24. 14. This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witnesse unto all Nations, Mar. 14. 9. Wheresoever this Gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, &c. Rom. 10. 18. Col. 1. 6. The Gospel is come unto you, as it is to all the world, and bringeth forth fruit. Also Tit. 2. 11. appeared unto all men.*

4. If the Charter whereby the Church is constituted, be Catholike, then the Church constituted thereby is one Catholike body: But the Charter constituting the Church is Catholike. Therefore, &c.

The major is clear of it self, One charter makes one polity. Sect. 2.
The minor will appear by those places of Scripture wherein the right of all Nations indefinitely is set down. *Mat. 28.19. Go teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c. Mar. 16.15. Ioh. 3.16. Eph. 3.6. That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and Συνομοι of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel, Whereof I was made a Minister.* When the partition wall was broken down between Jew and Gentile (and then the Church began to be Catholike) what second limits did God set unto his Church? none, except men would sever themselves by rejection of the Gospel, but external vocation and submission gave right *in foro Ecclesie* to be admitted members of the Church, and that was universal. If there be any particular Charter by which any particular Church was constituted beside the general, let that be produced, I know none. For if there were, then that particular visible Church could never fail, or else a Gospel Charter must be lost. But all particular Churches hold their priviledges by the general Covenant applied to themselves, as all the twelve Tribes did theirs by the Covenant made with *Abraham* and his seed. And all the several promises, which are as *appendices* to the Covenant, are made to the whole Church-Catholike, and commensurable therewith, respectively, without any respect to any particular Congregation or membership therein.

5. If there be Officers of a Church-Catholike visible, then Sect. 2.
there is a Church-Catholike visible. But there are Officers of a Church-Catholike visible. Therefore, &c. The major cannot be denied. The minor appears by the donation of the Ministry to the Church-Catholike visible, *Mat. 28.19. Go teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* They are not circumscribed or limited to any one place, but are sent into the whole world to all Nations, *1 Cor. 12.28. God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secundarily Propkets, thirdly Teachers, Eph. 4.11. He gave some Apostles, and some Propkets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastours and Teachers, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the Work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.* These two last places *M. Hooker* himself confesseth to be meant of the external, political body and Kingdom of Christ. Now these

Chap. 3. these extraordinary Officers, Prophets, Evangelists, were Officers of the Church Catholike visible; for they had no limits of place, but were over all the Churches, and yet are said not to be set in the Churches, but in the Church.

And this is granted by some of our brethren for Congregational Churches, that they were Catholike Officers, and therefore did not baptize in reference unto particular Congregations. And this M. Cartwright also in his *Catechism* acknowledgeth. The Apostles are usually called *πρωτοι οικουμενικοι* universal Judges.

M. Hooker in answer to this argument, *Surv. c. 15. pag. 272.* First, mistakes my words and meaning, for whereas I proved the universality of their office from the unlimitednesse of it, he conceives it of having no limits in their works, and so set down, but I meant no limits in regard of places. And then he saith the reason of their unlimitednesse arose from their *commission*, because it was general, being immediatly called by God to preach to all nations, and they had virtually all Church-power in them, but this did not issue nextly from the Church in which they were firstly set.

Ans. I confesse it did arise from their commission, which commission being general, made them general Officers, for what more can be required to make a general Officer but a general commission? it did not issue nextly from the Church, I confesse, neither doth the power of any particular Minister, but his power is given him by Christ, and not from the people, but is annexed unto his office; only the exercise thereof is drawn forth by the people, *pro hic & nunc*, and so the necessity of the whole Church drew forth their Apostolical Office into execution, and the necessity of a greater part of the Church may draw forth the exercise of any particular Ministers office beyond the limits of his Congregation occasionally.

6. If there be a general, external vocation, wherewith all Christians are called, and a general external Covenant wherinto all Christians voluntarily and externally enter, and are therein bound up in an unity, then there is a general external Catholike Church. But there is such an external general visible vocation, and external individual visible general Covenant, &c.
Therefore

Therefore, &c. I mean by *general*, Catholike, Universal, Oecu- Sect. 2.
menical, in regard (not only of kinde, but) of places.

The major appears by evidence of reason and experience ; for one Covenant with one King in any extent of compasse makes it one Kingdom. So &c.

The minor appears as evidently : For first, there is but one external general vocation divine, distinct from all other particular vocations, not only civil but Ecclesiastical, which is usually called our general calling : and this is external, else none but invisible beleevers were members of the visible Church, which is that we speak of.

And there is one individual expresse external Covenant, not only on Gods part. *Act. 2. 39. The promise is to you and to your children, and to as many as the Lord our God shall call.* Which is an external Covenant and call relating to baptism, which they were invited to in the former verse, yet not excluding the inward Covenant or call, but oft separated from the inward, and yet the right to baptism remain in *foro Ecclesie*. But also it is one external visible Covenant on mens part, which all Christians as Christians enter into, by their professed acceptance, and expresse restitution, and promised subjection and obedience : though not altogether in one place, or at one time.

7. If the initial visible seal, admittance and enrowlment, be Catholike and Oecumenical, then so is the Kingdom into which members are so initiated : But the initial seal, admission and enrowlment by baptism is Catholike. Therefore, &c.

The major is clear without control, he that takes up his freedom into a whole Corporation or Kingdom, is free of the whole, and in every part thereof, and hath right to all the general privileges and immunities thereof.

The minor also appears, both by the patent for Baptism, *Go baptize all Nations*, And by the consequences and priviledges thereof, they that are baptized in any Church are accounted visible subjects of Christs Kingdom in all places of the Christian world, no new baptism is required of them upon any removal : and also by the tenor thereof, for they are not baptized into the particular Congregation, but into the whole

Chap. 3.

visible body, and into the general Covenant, not into any particular Covenant.

8. If there be an external Catholike union of fraternity between all visible Christians in the whole world, there is one external visible Catholike Church. But there is one external Catholike union of fraternity between all visible Christians in the whole world. Therefore, &c.

The consequence of the major appears, because this fraternal union ariseth from the unity of the Church, which is constituted by one Covenant, into which they are all entred visibly. They are not made brethren by being invisible believers only, or in the same respect, for then only invisible believers were brethren, in the Scripture sense. If any one that is called a brother, be a drunkard, railer, extortioner, &c. 1 Corinth. 5. 11. Now few true believers are fornicators, idolaters, drunkards; therefore this brotherhood is in regard of a visible profession and membership.

The minor appears, because wherever the Apostles came if they found any visible believers they are said to finde brethren, *Act. 28. 14.* And it is the most usual term, that the Christians were called by, both in the *Acts of the Apostles*, and in the *Epistles*; not because they were of one particular Congregation, but because of the Church-Catholike, which are also called the household of faith. *Doe good unto all* (i. e. though heathens) *but especially to the household of faith.* Gal. 6. 10. The household is commensurable to the entertainment of the faith. Not the invisible members only, for they could not be known as such, but all the visible members.

Sect. 3.

9. If the same individual systeme or body of external laws, under one command, whereby all Churches equally should walk and be governed, be Catholike, then the Church is Catholike. But there is the same individual systeme or body of external laws under one command, whereby, &c. Therefore, &c.

The major is proved by evidence of reason, and experience of all bodies politick.

The minor is undeniable. For the same individual systeme expressed in the Gospel *totidem verbis* governs and guides the whole Catholike Church, It cannot be said the same in kinde only,

only, but the same for matter, manner, end, method, and expresse Sect. 3. words: unlesse we can say the severall copies are severall species, and then we in *England* have so many species of laws as there be copies printed of our laws. Neither is it the law *written in the heart, and put in the inward parts*; but the external systeme given to the Church as a body politicke. Neither is it the moral law *quâ* moral, but that in the hand of a Mediatour, with other positive laws added thereto.

Neither is this subjection unto these external laws arbitrary by the concurrent consent of divers Churches out of custome, or because of the equity and conveniency of them, *vi materia*, as divers Kingdoms now use the civil laws, or for intercourse with forreign Churches; but by vertue of the command of the authour of them. Neither have particular Churches any municipal laws divine of their own superadded to distinguish them, as *England* and *Scotland* have, but are wholly ruled by this Catholike systeme.

10. If there be a Catholike external communion, intercourse, and communication between all the members, and in all the particular Churches in the world, in worship, doctrine, and sign or seal of confirmation, nutrition, or commemoration of the same redemption visibly wrought by the same visible Saviour; then all those members or Churches, having this external communion, intercourse and communication, are one Catholike Church: But there is such a communion, &c. Therefore, &c.

The consequence appears, because communion ariseth from membership; there is an union presumed, before there can be a communion admitted, especially in the Lords Supper, which is a seal, and if an union, then a membership, for thereby they are made of the body: and if the communion be visible and external, then so is the union from whence it floweth, for *qualis effectus talis est causa*. And though there may be an admittance of a heathen to be present at the word, singing, praier, yet it is not an admittance into fellowship, for then we should have spiritual fellowship with idolaters; they may come and see what fellowship Christians enjoy with Christ, and one with another, but they are not admitted into that fellowship while heathens and idolaters,

Chap. 3.

ters, but after conversion, professed subjection and believing. After the 3000. were converted by *Peter*, and were baptized, they continued stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and prayer, *Act. 2. 41, 42.* And yet were not of one particular Church, not as our brethren themselves tell us, as I shewed before, therefore as members in general. And nothing is more usual then for members of one Congregation to joyn in the fellowship of the word read and preached, in singing and prayer with members of divers Congregations together, as at lectures or other occasions, and frequently also at the Lords table, even among our brethren in *New-England*, members of far distant Congregations do communicate occasionally. Also all the visible Churches on earth pray publicly, and give thanks, and on occasion may fast for the welfare of the whole Church on earth.

As for the evasion which some of our brethren have, that this communion of strangers with them is by vertue of a particular, present, transient membership with them; I conceive it of no force, nor warranted in the word of God. Then should those men be members of two Churches at once, then ought they to contribute to that Minister, then ought that Minister to take the charge of them, then (by some of our brethrens positions) should the whole Congregation have a hand in their admission. Also if there be any Ecclesiastical admissions or censures or transactions, or contributions that concern that particular Congregation, they also ought being members to have their vote and consent and hand therein. And then by the same reason all that came to a lecture which is a Church-fellowship in divine Ordinances of singing, prayer, preaching, and blessing the people, must so many times turn members of that Congregation, where such a meeting is. And then is it a dangerous thing to hear a lecture in a Congregation where the Minister or people are corrupt, for we thereby make our selves members of that Congregation, and so put our selves under that Pastour and those Elders for the present, and thereby give our allowance of them. It is not a subitane, occasional meeting, that can make a person a member of a Congregation, but constancy, *quoad intentionem*

tentionem saltem, saith Ames in medulla, lib. 1. cap. 32. Sect. 21. Sect. 3.
 And for communion of Churches, I shall speak of it afterward.
 And by this that hath been said, I suppose the minor is cleared
 also.

11. If the censure of excommunication of a person in one
 Congregation cuts him off from the Church-Catholike visible
 in regard of communion, which formerly he had right unto,
 then is there a Church-Catholike visible: But excommunication
 doth so, &c. Therefore, &c.

The consequence appears, because the ejection (being a cast-
 ing out of the body) cannot extend it self beyond the body,
 but ejection is general, therefore so is the body. The priva-
 tion cannot extend it self beyond the habit: if therefore the
 extent of the depriving censure be Catholike, the habitual body
 is so also. There is not only a *potentiality* of right to communi-
 cate every where, while a man is a member, but an *habitual*
right, not rising from courtesie, but from membership, not
 particular membership, for then none could communicate but
 particular members, but from a general habitual membership,
 to which the communion belongeth. So farre as the expulsion
 or disfranchisement reach, so far the Corporation reacheth, and
 as the particular ward or street (where such a man dwelt) lo-
 seth a particular member, so the whole Corporation loseth a
 member of the whole. So is it in this spiritual Corporation of
 the Church-Catholike visible. There is not only an habitual fit-
 nesse and capacity lost, but an habitual general right lost, du-
 ring the censure. The man is said to lose a member, when the
 hand loseth a finger, therefore the finger was a member of the
 whole man, as well as of the hand in particular. So is this case of
 excommunication.

12. If there be parts and members of the Church-Catholike
 visible there, then there is a whole Church-Catholike visible:
 but there are parts and members, &c. Therefore &c.

The consequence is undeniable, for whole and parts are *re-*
lata. Pars est qua continetur a toto, membrum ab integro. The
 minor is proved also, because particular Congregations and
 particular Christian families and persons are parts and mem-
 bers of the Church-Catholike visible. Either they are parts and
 members,

Chap. 3.

members, or they are none, and so out of the body, and *wick-
out* in the Apostles sense. If no members, then no right to Or-
dinances, for right ariseth from membership, membership from
qualifications. The same relation that particular believing per-
sons bear to a Christian family, and which Christian families
bear to a Congregation, the same relation by proportion doe
particular Congregations bear to the whole Church-Catholike
or any great part thereof. But particular persons are members
of families, and particular families of Congregations, and
therefore Congregations are members of the whole body of the
Church-Catholike visible. The family is consisted of the persons,
the Congregation of the families, and the Church-Catholike vi-
sible, or any great part thereof, of the particular Congregations.
A *Genus* cannot be said to consist of *species*, but to give essence
to *species*. *Animal rationale*, or humanity, doth not consist of
particular men, but exist in particular men. But whether the
Church-Catholike be a *genus* or an *integrum*, or both, I shall
handle in the next Chapter.

Sect. 4.

I might urge also the several metaphors whereby the Scri-
pture setteth out the whole number of visible believers under
an unity. As *Rev. 12. 1.* by a *woman clothed with the Sun*, (the
righteousnesse of Christ) and the *Moon* (all terrestrial things)
under her feet: or clothed with the Sun, the purity of doctrine,
and the moon (as some interpret it) discipline under her feet:
or, as some others expound it, Idolatry, whereof *Diana* the
Moon was chief and most general: or by Moon some under-
stand the legal ceremonial service which was guided much by
the Moon, under her feet, i.e. now abolished. So *M. Mede*. Now
this was a visible Church, because it is said to be seen, and is
opposed either to the Jewish Church that had these ceremo-
nies formerly on her back, or to the Jewish Christian Church,
which could not for a long time cast them off; but this Christian
Church did. Surely it was not a particular Congregation that
John saw, nor is it meant of divers particular Congregations, for
then it should have been *women*, not a *woman*, therefore it was
the Church-Catholike visible bound up in an unity.

Also *Joh. 10. 16.* It is set out by one sheep-fold. *Other sheep
I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and*

there shall be one fold and one Shepherd. Which is by all interpreted of the union of Jew and Gentile, which are the two integral parts of the Church-Catholike. And though by sheep should be meant the elect, yet they are considered as visible, because brought into a fold in this world, and such a fold as the thief may enter possibly into, as it is in the former verses, yea, and the wolf also, *Act. 20. 19*. Beza noteth upon that place in *John*, that by sheepfold is not meant the flock it self, but something that holds them together, and makes them one flock. *Camerarius* on the place, *Est Indicium Ecclesie sancte Catholicae in toto Orbe terrarum, &c.* And *Salmasius*, *Ut una est Ecclesia, ita unus est grex Christi, vel unum Ovile. Portiones gregis illius, sunt greges civitatum particulares. Hinc grex & Ecclesia idem sunt, tam in generali, quam speciali notione.* *Salmas. apparatus. 263.*

Also it is called the body of Christ, *Rom. 12. 5.* As we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another. This was not meant of the particular Church of Rome, for the Apostle puts in himself into this body, who had as then never come at Rome, therefore it is the Church-Catholike there spoken of, whereof Paul was both a member, and a Minister. And this body is a visible body, because it is Organical, and organical because the Apostle thereupon reckons up the several offices in the Church, as teaching, exhorting, giving, ruling, shewing mercy, which some compute to be an exact distribution of Church-Offices. So called also *1 Cor. 10. 17.* *1 Cor. 12. 12, 13.* *Eph. 4. 4.* Also the house of God, as I shewed before, *1 Tim. 3. 15.* And a great house *2 Tim. 2. 20.* which sets out the Church-Catholike. Now had these places been meant of particular Congregations, then they should have been called bodies, houses, sheep-folds. But as many members in a body hinder not the unity of the whole, and many Towns in a Kingdome, and many houses in a city, and many rooms in a house, or in the Ark, hinder not the unity thereof; so many particular Congregations hinder not the unity of the Church-Catholike. *Est una sola Christi Ecclesia, quae ob id etiam dicitur Catholica. Particulares Ecclesiae non sunt impedimento quin una sit Ecclesia, Zanch. de Ecclesia.*

Chap. 4.

My Dove, my undefiled is but one, she is the only one of her mother, Can. 6. 9. She is the Lilly among the thorns, Can. 2. 2. which is the Church militant. She is called the Sponse of Christ, Cant. 4. 8, 9, 10. Again, Cant. 6. 4. Thou art beautiful O my love as Tirzah, comely as Jerusalem, terrible as an army with banners. These things are spoken of the Church militant: and though some things here mentioned be spoken in regard of the invisible company only, the better part, yet to them as visible, and as terrible by discipline. And 2 Thes. 2. 4. It is said of Antichrist, that he as God sitteth in the temple of God. By Temple is meant the Church of God, and this a visible Church, yet no particular Congregation, but the general Church-Catholike, or at least the greatest part of it, for it is said, Rev. 13. 3. All the world wondered after the beast. And Rev. 17. 1. She is said to sit upon many waters, which are as is expounded, vers. 15. Peoples, and multitudes, and Nations, and tongues. And Rev. 18. 3. It is said that All Nations have drunk of the wine of her fornication, and the Kings of the earth have committed fornication with her.

Yea, the holy Ghost chooseth to joyn many particular Churches together by Nouns collective, Nouns of multitude in the singular number. Remarkable is that 1 Pet. 5. 2. where writing to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithinia; he calls them all one flock, *Feed the flock of God which is among you.* And from this place Mr. Bayns granteth that all the Churches of the world may be called Occumenical. Bayns Diocles. Tryal. p. 12. conclus. 1. And so Act. 20. To the Elders of Ephesus. The Churches of Galatia are compared to one lump. Gal. 5. 5.

CHAP. IV.

That the Church-Catholike visible is one Integral, or totum Integrals.

NOW because I see it is much stumbled at, that I made the Church-Catholike to be *Totum integrals*, and because it will

will let much light into the Question in hand, I shall endeavour Sect. 1.
to prove that the Church-Catholike visible is an integral, or *totum integrale*.

And first negatively, that it is not a *Genus*. First, a *Genus* is Sect. 1.
made or drawn *per abstractionem Logicam (vel metaphysicam*,
as M. Ellis conceiveth :) but an Integral is made or constituted
per conjunctionem sive appositionem physicam, vel politicam. Now
the Church-Catholike visible is not made or drawn by logical
or metaphysical abstraction, but by political conjunction, com-
bination or apposition of the parts and members thereof.
So Ames, *medul.* lib. 1. cap. 33. Sect. 18. *Sicut per fidem Ec-*
clesia habet statum essentialem, & per combinationem, integra-
lem, sic etiam per ministerium habet Organicum quendam
statum.

2. A *Genus* hath no existence of its own, but so hath
the Church-Catholike visible, viz. *Per combinationem, sive ag-*
gregationem. No *genus* can be capable of combination
or aggregation, for that is an accident belonging to an inte-
gral.

3. It appears by the definition of a *genus* both according to
the *Ramists* and *Aristotelians*. The *Ramists* say, *Genus est totum*
partibus essentiale. The *genus* is essential to its parts, i. e. *spe-*
cies. But *Integrum est totum cui partes sunt essentielles vel inte-*
grales. Now the several Churches are integrant to the Church-
Catholike visible, they make and constitute the Occumenical by
aggregation.

And according to the *Aristotelians*, *Genus est totum quod de*
pluribus specie differentibus potest predicari in quid. Now this
cannot agree to the Church-Catholike or Occumenical, for the
particular Churches do not differ *specie*, by any specific forms,
but only by accidental and numerical differences. Unless you
will say that *Individua sunt species*, which as it is generally de-
nied, so it is most unlikely in similar bodies of all others. And
if the single Churches be *Individua*, then at the most the Occu-
menical can be but a *species*, yea, *species infima*. So Ames *med.*
c. 31. s. 18. *Ecclesia hac (viz. Cath.) est mystica ratione una, non*
genericè, sed quasi species specialissima, vel individuum, quia
nullas habet species propriè dictas. And yet I acknowledge be

Chap. 4.

saith, c. 32. §. 5. *Ecclesia particularis respectu communis illius naturae quae in omnibus Ecclesijs particularibus reperitur, est species Ecclesia in genere, sed respectu Ecclesiae Catholicae quae habet rationem integri, est membrum ex aggregatione variorum membrorum singularium compositum, atq; adeo respectu ipsorum est etiam integrum.*

A *similar totum* differs much from an *universal*, similarity of parts doth not at all hinder integrality, but universality is of another nature, being an abstract second notion. Society or polity is a *Genus*, and is divided or rather distinguished into *civil* and *Ecclesiastical*: now indeed *civil* polity hath distinct *species*, viz. *monarchical, aristocratical, democratical, and mixed*: but *Ecclesiastical* polity hath none of Gods appointment. Indeed there is Papal, Prelatical, and Presbyterial, but the former are humane, the last (as I conceive) divine. I confesse also this last is in dispute whether it be combined or independent, but this distinction our ignorance hath brought forth, there is but one by Gods institution. It is true also, that some members are invisible, and some visible only, but the invisible have their external communion in Ordinances *quae* visible; as they are under Ecclesiastical polity they are all considered as visible: but this distinction makes not two species of Churches or polities, for as invisible members they have no officers, but as visible.

I acknowledge there may by the minde of man, a community of nature be abstracted from any similar bodies, and so consequently from the similarity of Congregations, but whether that be sufficient to make a *genus*, where there are no distinct specific differences under it, I shall leave to the Logicians to dispute it out. And to make this *totum genericum existens*, is beyond my apprehension, seeing *genus* being a second notion existeth not, but *in intellectu nostro: habet fundamentum in rebus, non existentiam*. For as it doth exist it is an integral, and loseth its abstract nature, wherein the universality doth consist. That which existeth in the Individual is not *totum*, but *pars essentialis individui*. As it is abstracted by the minde, and relateth to the *Genus*, it is but *symbolum causa materialis*, as it is existing in the Individual, it is *ipsa causa materialis Individui*. And therefore

fore though it be said that *tota natura Generis conservatur in Sect. 2. una specie*, and by this rule *in uno individuo*, it must be *fundamentaliter* only, *non formaliter*, for there is no such universality formally *in specie*, & *multo minus in Individuo*. As the nature of a flock is not reserved in one sheep, or a corporation in one man, to use M. Hookers own words. *Sac. cap. 15. pag. 261.* One Church also may be more pure then another, and larger then another, but these accidents vary not the species.

But 2. I shall prove the Oecumenical Church is an Integral. *Sect. 2.* First, because it hath an existence of its own, which no *Genus* hath. And this existence appears because it hath an external form and state which no *Genus* can have. This *Ames* confesseth, as I shewed before, yea, the Church Catholike visible had an existence before it was divided into particular societies, in the beginning of it, in the Apostles daies, as I shewed before, and that not as Entitative only, but under the general Officers, with whom they did communicate, in doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread and praier.

2. Because the several and singular Churches do constitute and make up the Oecumenical, as members of it, now *membrum & integrum sunt relata*. A *genus* hath no members. The particular Churches are integrant to the whole, and the whole results out of them. Hence *Salmasius* hath this passage, *Universum Ecclesiae corpus in majora membra divisum*, Appar. 285. Every particular Congregation contains part of the matter and part of the form of the whole, I mean with *Ames* in respect of the external state of it. But a *Genus* hath no external state. *Quod habet partes extra partes est Totum integrale, sed Ecclesia universalis visibilis habet partes extra partes; Ergo.* The *major* is the very definition of *totum integrale*. The *minor* is clear, for the particular Churches are different one from another & *situ & ordine*, & *singula sua prae se habent quantitate*, & *non se invicem permeant*. They are not only distinct in consideration, but in existence, and exist one besides another as Towns in a Kingdom.

3. Nay, it appears further to be an integral, because it is made up not only of the particular Congregations, but of individual Christians, not only such as are particular members of particular Congregations, but such as are not members of

Chap. 4.

any particular Congregation, as I suppose all Christians are not fixed members, nor can be, as I could give divers instances, as in regard of habitation, perigrination, banishment, want of opportunity, scrupulosity. If such be not members of the Church-Catholike because not fixed, then the Apostles themselves and Evangelists were none, for they were not fixed: but we finde that they were not only members, but officers, and so related to the body as organical. A Corporation or City consisteth not only of streets, wards, and companies, but of persons within their liberties though dwelling alone. Now if the Church-Catholike be a *genus*, it cannot be abstracted from them both, if it be abstracted from particular Congregations, and so be a *genus* of societies and polities, then it doth not contain such as are not in any societies or polities: if it be abstracted from them as particular unfixed members, then it is no *genus* of particular Churches, for they are none, nor of any. But as the Church is an *integrum* it may be made up of both, and result out of both.

4. That which hath inherent accidents and adjuncts existing in it, as its own, that is an integral, for a *genus* is not capable of them: But the Church-Catholike visible hath accidents inharing, adhering, and betiding unto it and existing in it. Therefore it is an integral.

The major is undeniable. The minor appeareth by instance. Beauty, strength, offensive, defensive, purity, terribleness with banners (*viz.* of discipline) conspicuity, order, visibility, &c. are accidents that may and sometimes have been, and some of them are still existing in the whole Church, as belonging to the whole: therefore it is an integral.

Again, That which is capable of being *major* and *minor*, i. e. is sometimes greater and sometimes lesse in extent, that is an integral, but so is the Church-Catholike or Oecumenical. The consequence is clear, because a *Genus* can neither be greater or lesse then it ever was. *Animal* was as great a *Genus* when there were but two men, and a few beasts in the world, as it is now there are many millions: for the greatnesse of the *genus* is not measured by continuous or discreet quantity; but the nearer *Ens* it is, and the further from Individuals, the greater the *Genus* is, i. e. the more comprehensive; and the further remote

remote from *Ens*, and the nearer the Individuals, the lesse the *Genus* is, i.e. the lesse comprehensive. But the Oecumenical Church is measured by quantity continuous in regard of place wherein it is, and discrete in regard of number of the Churches and members thereof: sometimes the bounds thereof are enlarged, and sometimes streightned. There is an augmentation by addition of members, a diminution by subtraction, and the whole resulteth out of the aggregation of the parts, not by local contiguity alwaies, but by political, Ecclesiastical, habitual consociation and union in the same external profession, subjection, and fraternity. Sect. 3.

Again, that *totum* which is mutable and fluxile, is an integral, for a *Genus* is immutable, constant, permanent, *eterna veritatis*. But the Church Oecumenical is very mutable and fluxile, sometime flourishing, sometime under persecution: sometimes conspicuous, sometimes it may be latent: sometimes more pure, sometimes more corrupt: sometimes it hath more beauty and strength, and sometimes lesse: and though this be in the parts and members, the particular Churches, yet it may be in the whole, and the beauty and strength of the parts of a natural or civil body is the beauty and strength of the whole man, City, Kingdom: every member hath his own beauty and strength, and out of them all resulteth the beauty and strength of the whole.

Again, That *totum* which is measured by time and place, is an integral: for *Genus* which is a notion is capable of neither of them; but so is the Church Oecumenical: Hence we divide the Church into primitive and successive. From the time of *John the Baptist* the Kingdom of Heaven suffers violence, *Mat. II. 12*. Sometime the Church hath been planted in the Eastern parts of the world, and now is more Westerly, and is in likelihood still going more Westward. We use to limit the Church within the pale thereof, though potentially, in regard of permission, and (haply) promise, it may be actually over the whole earth. *Amplius & vetustas sunt accidentia Ecclesie visibilis*. See *Cameron de consp. Ecclesia*.

3. That *Totum* whereinto there is admission, wherein there is nutrition and edification, and out of which there is ejection, that

Chap. 4.

is an integral: But there is admission into the Church-Catholike visible by Baptism, nutrition and edification by the other external Ordinances, and ejection out of it by excommunication: Therefore it is an Integral. For a *Genus* is capable of none of these. Indeed if you consider this society in reference to other societies or religions, it is a distinct kinde, in regard of the Authour, laws, qualifications of members; but in reference unto its members it is an integral: If this be all that is meant by *totum genericum existens*, it may passe without any damage to this question. So the severall companies in *London* are distinct from other companies, yet in reference to their own members they are integrals, and in reference to the whole they are parts.

6. That society which hath not only a head or governour in heaven, of the same nature as man: but Officers on earth, which are indefinitely and habitually Officers to the whole, that is an integral: but so hath the Oecumenical Church, therefore it is an integral. A *Genus* is not capable of Officers: But the Church-Catholike had once (by *M. Ellis's* own confession) actual, universal Officers, and was then one governed body: and still the Officers are indefinitely and habitually Officers to the whole, as shall be proved in *Chap. 7.* And the visibility of the head in *Chap. 5. Sect 6.*

7. That which hath actions and operations of its own, that is an integral, for a *Genus* is not capable thereof, but the Church-Catholike or Oecumenical hath or may have actions, operations and effects of its own. Therefore, &c.

The minor, upon which all the weight of this argument lyeth, is proved thus. The Church-Catholike visible may by their delegates meet in a general Council, about the affairs that concern the whole, and though their power therein were but only consultative and suasive (as *M. Ellis* grants) yet it is an act of the whole, as the acts of a Kingdom represented in Parliament are said to be national acts; but I conceive they may do more, even make decrees, as well as the Synod, *Act. 15.* They may confute and suppress general heresies and disorders. Yea, and the whole Church-Catholike may yield consent, submission and obedience thereunto, as their acts, finding them agreeable

to the word of God. There may be a general humiliation of the whole Church-Catholike visible, or a general thanksgiving, as occasion may be offered. There may be a general contestation with the same hereticks, and renouncing of their errours, a general suffering under, and conflict with, and conquest over the same adversaries, as suppose Antichrist, and Triumphant over them. See *Rev. 19. the 7. first verses*, All Gods servants both small and great are called to it. *I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thundrings, saying, Alleluiah.* This was not the act of a particular Congregation, but of the Church Catholike, and yet all these are. *vers. 8.* bound up in an unity, and they are called the *Lambs wife*, and unto her was granted, &c. The Church-Catholike visible also conquereth and subdueth spiritually the rest of the world, and bringeth them into external subjection to Christ, and leaveneth them with the doctrine of Christ, and uniteth them to themselves in this spiritual society, so that they become *Συσταμα* one body. And though this be done by particular members and Churches, yet that hinders it not from being the act of the whole, as when an army of souldiers of one Kingdom conquer neighbour Kingdoms, and adde them to their own (as the *Romans* did all the world) it is accounted the action of the whole nation, or a national act: so is this case though the conquest differ in kinde. And this may serve for an answer to *M. Hookers* query, *Surv. c. 16. p. 256. 259.* "Whether the Church-Catholike can be considered as distinct from the particular Churches (not by separation of the whole from the parts, but) in apprehension, by presenting some distinct Officer, act, or operation, which do not pertain to the particular Churches. For as there is a head and King of the whole, as visible, and one systeme of laws, and habitual, indefinite Officers of the whole, so you see there are acts and operations of the whole, both by their delegates, and by themselves, which though they be performed by particular persons belonging (happily) to particular Churches (as the souldiers making up an army belong to several Towns) yet do not perform them as particular members of the particular Churches, but of the whole, neither do they convert into the particular Churches,

Chap. 4. but into the whole : as such souldiers fight not as members of such a Town, but of such a Kingdom, and conquer not to enlarge their severall Towns, but the Kingdom in general. And for constant actual Officers, and distinct services, such as the national Church of the Jews had, because they could meet together three times every year, and oftner upon occasion, they cannot be expected in the Oecumenical body, it being too large for such constant meetings.

If the Church-Catholike can bring forth sons, then it can perform operations : But it can bring forth sons. This M. Ellis himself confesseth by consequence, for in the close of his Epistle Dedicatory before his *vindicia Catholica*, he subscribes himself a *sonne of the Church*. What other Church can he mean but the Catholike? If he meaneth the particular Church whereof he is Pastour, he is not a son but a father, and governour of that : and then he should more properly have said, *Sonne of a Church*, not *Sonne of the Church*, for there be more Churches then this, unlesse he meant *the* by way of eminency. He cannot mean of the Church of *England*, for he denies all National Churches, therefore it must be of the Church-Catholike, and yet he denies that there is any such thing visible, and that which he doth acknowledge he makes a *Genus* ; which is a second notion without existence, and then, as himself confesseth, *Non-existentis nulla sunt operationes*. The *species* or *Individuals* cannot be sonnes of the *Genus*. And therefore he should more safely have subscribed himself a member or Minister of the Church ; and yet that must have proved the Church-Catholike : or of a Church, and then he might have meant his own.

8. It will appear by the severall appellations which are given to the Church-Catholike in Scripture. For in Scripture it is called a *Body*, yea, *Σῶμα* one and the same body, which hath one head or governour, which hath constant influence into that body : even into those that are only visible members in common works, and into the invisible members in saving works, and governs both by external laws. Now a *Genus*, though it hath subordinate *Species*, yet is no body, nor hath any head or governour, nor any influence given unto it, neither is it governed by any external laws, for then it must exist. Yea, the Church-

Catholike

Catholike visible is called a *body* fitly joyned together and compacted, by that which every joint supplyeth. Eph. 4. 16. which appears to be the external, political Kingdom of Christ, as M. Hooker calls it, and applyeth this Chapter, because here are the Officers reckoned up, yea, the extraordinary general Officers. *Ubi omnes partes existunt simul compactae, ibi totum integrale existit; Sed omnes partes Ecclesiae Catholicae visibiles existunt simul compactae. Ergo totum integrale totius Ecclesiae Catholicae visibiles existit.* This M. Hooker saith is true of a *Totum genericum existens*, but not that all particular Congregations do exist aggregated together, as members of the Catholike, p. 268. But how a *Genus* can be a body, and the particular *species* fitly joyned together and compacted, by that which every joint supplyeth, I cannot understand. The relation between a *Genus* and *species* cannot be compared to joynts compacting and joyning a body together, but most properly relateth to the union of an *integrum*.

Also it is called a Kingdom, as I shewed before. *The Kingdom of his dear sonne*, Col. 1. 13. The Gospel is called *the Gospel of the Kingdom*, Mat. 4. 23. And the *Word of the Kingdom*, Mat. 13. 19. And such as are only visible members are called *the children of the Kingdom*, Mat. 8. 12. And this Kingdom hath a King and Laws and Officers in it; now a Kingdom or society is no *Genus*, but an Integral. It is also called a *Tabernacle*, Revel. 21. 3. which was a thing coupled together with tenons, sockets, loops, and ratches, and so an integral, no *Genus*, nor could signifie any. It is called also an *house or building*, 1 Tim. 3. 15, *The Church which is the house of God*. 1 Cor. 3. 9. Ye are Gods building, Eph. 2. 21. *In whom all the building fitly framed together*, &c. which is the Catholike Church visible consisting of Jews and Gentiles, built on the visible foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone. And a *household*, Gal. 6. 10.

Also it is called a *Temple* in the fore-cited Eph. 2. 21. 1 Cor. 3. 17. 2 Cor. 6. 16. Now the Temple was an Integral. Also it is called a *city*, and the members thereof Jews and Gentiles are called *fellow-citizens*. Eph. 2. 19. Also an *army* terrible with banners, Cant. 6. 10. Also it is called a *sheepfold*, a *wheat-field*, a

Chap. 4.

barn-floor, a dragge-net. a loaf of bread made up of divers grains, 1 Cor. 10. 17. Now all these, and many more appellations have no analogy to a *Genus*, but to an *Integrum*. Therefore the Church-Catholike visible is an *Integrum*.

9. It appears to be an *Integral* from the words which the Scripture useth to expresse the Church and union of the members of the Church-Catholike together. As *Act. 2. 41.* *There were added about 3000. souls προσετέθησαν.* They were put unto them, as an encrease: now a *Genus* is not capable of addition by numbers, but an *Integral* only. Also *Eph. 4. 12.* The Officers (general as well as particular) are given to the whole external, political body of Christ (to use M. Hookers own words) for the perfecting of the Saints, *πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων, ad coagmentationem sanctorum.* It signifyeth properly to make a thing perfect by filling of it up, *omnibus numerum absolutum reddere*, or as some render it, to set in joint again. All the significations agree only to an *Integral*. And for the edifying of the body of Christ, *εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ. i. e.* the building up of the body, relating to the whole Church. This is proper only to an *Integral*. A word also much like this, and more significant for the purpose in hand, we have *Eph. 2. 22.* *In Whom also ye are builded together for an habitation of God, &c.* *Συναποικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον,* which signifyeth a knitting together in a building. Also *vers. 21.* *In Whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy Temple.* Here are three words note Integrality. First, the whole building *πᾶσα ἡ οἰκοδομή,* 2. fitly framed, *συναρμολογημένη:* 3. groweth, *αὐξέει.* So *Eph. 4. 16.* *From Whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplyeth, according to the effectual Working in the measure of every part, maketh encrease of the body, unto the edifying of it self in love.* Here are divers words which properly notify an *Integral:* 1. *πᾶν τὸ σῶμα,* the whole body, 2. *συναρμολογημένον* fitly joyned, *congruente proportionem constructum vel connexum.* 3. *συμβαλλόμενον,* compactum, compacted. 4. *by that which every joint supplyeth,* *διὰ πῶς αὐτὸς τῆς συνδεσμῆς per omnem commissuram suppeditationis, vel juncturam subministrationis.* 5. *ἐν μέτρῳ ἑνὸς ἑκάστου μέτρος in mensura uniuscujusque membri.* 6. *τὴν αὐξήσιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται, augmentum corporis facit.* 7. *εἰς οἰκοδομὴν*
ἐαυτοῦ

ἐαυτοῦ, in edificationem sui. The like we finde, *Col. 2. 19.* From Sect. 3. *Whom all the body by joints and hands having nourishment, ministered and knit together encreaseth with the encrease of God.* The words are most of them the same with the former in the Original. There is 1. a whole body, 2. joints, 3. bands, *συνδέσμων*; and nourishment ministered *ἐπιχορηγούμενον*. 4. knit together. 5. encreaseth with encrease, *αὐξέει τὴν αὐξήσιν*. And though much spoken in these places seem to be applicable to the invisible company, yet to them as visible, receiving edification from their Officers, and having visible communion one with another: and the Apostle speaks indefinitely of the Church under their Officers, without making any difference of kindes of believers. Also *Act. 17. 34.* certain men clave unto him *καλλυθέντες αὐτῷ* were glued unto him, i. e. *Paul.* And in the Old Testament, *Isa. 14. 1.* *The strangers shall be joyned with them (Israel) and they shall cleave unto the house of Jacob.* *וְיִלְלִי וְקִיפִי אֶת־בֵּית־יַעֲקֹב* & copulabit se & adhaerebunt. All which and many more words in Scripture about the Church, shew it to be an integral.

10. If the invisible Church be one body of Christ (as in the primary sense they are) then by the same reason the visible also (as visible) are one body, for the only difference between them (as to this purpose) is in regard of the manner of communion; the one invisibly and inwardly, the other visibly in outward Ordinances. The invisible are called Christs body in allusion to a natural body more properly; the visible in allusion to a political body. The invisible Church are only in reference to Christ their head and fellow-invisible members, but have no Officers under Christ (*quæ* invisible:) the visible are one in reference to Christ their professed King, and his written laws, and fellow-visible members, and indefinite Officers under Christ. The invisible body might with better reason be called a *Genus*, because their unity is only in the head, and in one kinde of nature, and in spiritual relation to invisible brethren; and therefore if they be called one body: then much more the visible Church, whose union is in King, laws, the same qualifications, and external relation to visible brethren, under indefinite Officers.

M. Hooker takes much pains in *Surv. c. 15.* to prove that the Church-Catholike visible cannot be an Integral. To which I

Chap. 4. shall answer under the several heads as they come in the Thesis.

His main Argument is because that an *Integrum* resulting out of the members, is *Symbolum effecti*, and so is in consideration after the members whereof it is constituted, and out of which it doth result, and so that crosseth the second part or predicate of the Question. This I shall refer to the second part of the Question.

Secondly, That it will then require one visible head over it. This I shall refer to that Objection in Chap. 5. Sect. 6.

Sect. 4. Thirdly, That which he objects against the visibility of the Church-Catholike I shall refer to the next Chapter, Cha. 5.

An Objection may be raised here, That the Church-Catholike may by persecutions, wars, &c. be brought into a narrow room, and haply to one Congregation.

Ans. It is possible, yet all the essence and priviledges of the Church-Catholike visible are *contracted and reserved therein*, and from them conveyed and derived ministerially to those whom they shall convert, and so shall dilate it self again.

To this M. Ellis replyeth first, with little better then a scoff. "We see (saith he) what straights this large conceit of the universal visible Church doth drive unto. *Vind.* pag. 58. But I let that passe. He answers secondly, that this answer implyeth that the Church-Catholike is a *species*, and the particular Churches the severals of it: this confoundeth universal and particular.

But how doth this imply it? Suppose a city should by pestilence or fire, &c. be brought to the tenth of the buildings and men that sometime it had; yet retaining the same Charter and Officers, and priviledges, it is still the same city, though not so great as before: and must this imply that the city is a *genus* or universal, and the particular streets the *species* or particulars under it? no, but the city was the integral, and they the parts: it is now mutilated and maimed, but it may be rectified, and grow populous again: and so may the Church though much wasted. Nay it implyeth that it is not a *genus*, for that cannot be contracted nor dilated, for it is a notion not existing, as M. Ellis himself confesseth. *Vind.* pag. 58.

M. Hooker also *Ser.* v. 360, 361. hath an Objection much to the same

same purpose, and to that the same answer shall serve.

Sect. 4.

But he further objects, That this contracted Church extends not it self to all persons and places, as was said of the Church-Catholike before.

Ans. Actually the Church-Catholike did never so extend it self when at largest, but *potentially* in regard there is liberty for all to accept it and enjoy those priviledges, and so there is still left.

Obut this Congregation may fail, the Catholike cannot.

Ans. The whole may in it self, but is kept by Gods power and promise, at least some remnants of it. For it cannot wholly fail.

Obut an *Integrum* cannot be reserved in a member of it.

Ans. It cannot be so large an *Integrum*, nor every way the same, yet the whole being similar, though great part be taken away, yet the remainder is an integral to the parts that are left, though but a member to what was formerly.

I shall here also consider a little that notion whereby he would seem to untie the knot of this difficulty, p. 259. and 260.

"That only (saith he) which put fair colours upon this
"false conceit, is the misapprehension of some particular ex-
"amples, *viz.* when they say, that any portion of water divi-
"ded, every part of it is water, and hath the name and nature
"of it. The answer is, that the predication or affirmation of
"it is not by vertue of that division of a portion of water that
"is made, as *Integri in membra*: but because the nature is pre-
"served in the least portion of it, and thence this predication,
"this water is water, is made good, because a *Genus* and *Speci-*
"es are there preserved and attended, going along with the di-
"vision of *Integri in membra*. For when we say *Hac aqua est a-*
"qua, the Arguments are *Genus* and *Species*.

Ans. That it is an essential predication it cannot be denied, but this doth not necessarily make them *genus* and *species*, for there is an essential predication of *species infima* on all the Individuals, as well as of the *genus* on the *species*, but there is a great difference between the *Species* and *Individuals*; for the *Species* exist not, and therefore cannot be brought into an integral, but the individuals may: as we see many great integrals

of

Chap. 4.

of water in the sea and rivers, &c. which contain many individuals in one integral, but not many *species*: as may be shewed both in natural and political bodies.

It is true, the predication is not by vertue of that division of *Integri in membra*, but because the form of water, to which the properties of water do belong, is retained in the particular parts or members. And so every visible beleever is called a Christian, and a member of Christs visible Kingdom, because the form (*viz.* visible beleaving) common to all Christians and all members, is found in him: and every particular Church is called a Church, because the form common to all Churches is found in it: to which forms all the priviledges and properties and promises of a Christian or of a Church, as members of the whole body, do belong.

Now hence ariseth another Question more likely to decide the controversie, *viz.* whence this right in this common nature doth arise? whether from its self or by vertue of a Covenant? If by vertue of a Covenant, then whether by a Covenant between man and man, or between God and man? If by vertue of a Covenant between man and man, such as is the Covenant of particular Congregations (which our brethren make the form thereof) which the particular members enter into: then none that want particular membership, or are not invested therein by that particular Covenant, can have any right to any priviledges or promises of the Church. Then the Apostles, Evangelists, &c. either wanted right to the Ordinances, priviledges and promises, or had their right by vertue of some particular membership of, and covenant with the Church of *Jernsalem*, or some other particular Churches; but we reade of no such thing.

Then how can a man converted from heathenism have right to Baptism, which is a priviledge of the Church, and an Ordinance of God, seeing he is no member of, nor in Covenant with any Congregation, neither can be until baptized, as I conceive, See *Q. 2. S. 4.*

If this right come by the general visible covenant between God and all visible beleevers, and all these visible beleevers by this general visible Covenant are made an external body and kingdom

kingdom of Christ, then all these priviledges, and promises belonging to visible beleevers are given first to the whole body, and secondarily to the members thereof. The being a member for a particular Congregation giveth only opportunity of enjoying the priviledges of the external body, but not the actual immediate right thereunto, for that they had before any such admittance or combination by vertue of their being visible beleevers,, and so being members of the body, in the general external Covenant. No man will say, that this particular drop of water is cold and moist, because it is a part or member of this particular pond or river, but because it is a part of the element of water, unto which primarily those properties do belong, and yet the element of water is not united into one body, by any Covenant, as the whole Church is.

But if this be true that *hac aqua est aqua*, be *genus* and *species*, then it followeth that there are so many *species* of water as there be drops in the whole element of water, and so by consequence a hundred thousand *species* of water in every pail-full: and as many *species* of wine as there are drops of wine, and so many *species* of milk as there are drops of milk, for it may be said of every drop of water, wine, or milk, they are water, wine, or milk.

Can the variation only of situation, or accidents vary the *species*? This man is a man, there is *genus* and *species*. 2. This man is an English man, there should be another subaltern *species*. 3. This English is a *Suffolk* man, there should be another inferior *species*. 4. This *Suffolk* man is of such a particular hundred, there should be another inferior *species*. 5. This man is of such a Town in that hundred, as suppose *Ipswich*, there is another inferior *species*. 6. This *Ipswich* man is of such a Parish, there is another *species*. 7. This man of such a Parish is of such a street in the Parish, there is another inferior *species*. 8. This man is of such a Family in such a street, there is another inferior *species*. The like descention may be made of particular Churches. By this reason man will prove a very large *Genus*, that hath so many subaltern *species* under him, and many more may be made by the same reason. Yea, the same man will vary his *species* as oft as he varieth his place. I conceive this proposition

Chap. 4.

sition *Hec aqua est aqua*, will at best be but *species infirma & individuum*: and the like of *hic homo est homo*: but the predication of this man by the several particular divisions and subdivisions of the Kingdom will prove *denominatio adjuncta personae subiectis*: and this division of a Kingdom into more particular parts, will rather prove a division of *integri in membra* then *generis in species*,

But suppose this should be granted (which Logicians will not) yet it must also be granted, that as there may be such second notions of *this man*, or *this Church*, raised by logical abstraction, so there must needs be an integrality resulting out of physical contiguity, or political conjunction and aggregation of places, persons and Churches.

But let it be supposed that by logical abstraction we may draw a notion of a *genus* from the similarity of all Churches, or community of nature in all Churches, though the Churches differ not from each other by any essential, different, specific forms, but only accidentally, as individuals: yet also it must be granted that by the unity of the Covenant and Charter wherein they are all bound up in an unity, and by political combination which necessarily followeth thereupon, we may raise an integrality, for they are all members of the Church-militant, of Christs external Kingdom on earth, and so they become really and necessarily members of a *political integrum*. And on this Integral were the priviledges of the Church bestowed primarily, and on particular visible Churches but secondarily, as members of the whole body. Let it be granted that these priviledges are bestowed by God upon such a sort of men, so and so qualified (*viz.* visible beleevers) and from their similarity of disposition, may be drawn a community of nature or disposition, yet the priviledges of the Church do not accrue unto them, because so and so qualified, but by vertue of that one external, individual Covenant of God, made unto such qualified persons, by which external Covenant they are made externally one habitual, external, visible body.

And if the same company of men so qualified can make a *Genus* by abstraction (though there be no specific distinct subaltern forms) and yet be an Integral because of the external

nal visible Covenant under one head, into which they are all Sect. 5.
entred, which is the fountain of all their priviledges, I shall
yield the Church Catholike visible to be a *Genus*, as well as an
Integrum: and call it with *Ames*, *Univerſaliter Integrale*. But
if ſuch an uſe can be made of that logical tenet, that *Individu-*
als are ſpecies, (which yet moſt Logicians do deny) that thoſe
individuals cannot be political members of one greater body, I
fear it will prove more prejudicial to policy, then beneficial to
Logick.

Again, that which M. *Hooker* makes peculiar to an Integral,
from that which we call *totum univerſale* is, that *what belongs*
to this, doth not belong to all its members, Sur.c.15. p.256. Is true
only of *Integrum diſſimilare*, for it is not true of *Integrum ſi-*
milare, for as a whole pinte of water doth moiſten and cool,
ſo doth every drop in its meaſure and proportion. And ſo it is
peculiar only to a diſſimilar Integral.

I ſhall note alſo two things in that Chapter wherein M. *Hoo-* Sect. 5.
ker miſtaketh my meaning. Firſt, in the ſeventh propoſition
which he collects out of my Theſis ſet down, p.252, *Every par-*
ticular Church partaketh of part of the matter, and part of the form
of the whole. Which p. 261. he makes uſe of again, and renders
it thus, *Eccleſia Catholica gives part of the matter and part of the*
form to all particular Churches. But my meaning was, it doth
conſiſt of part of the matter, and part of the form of the whole:
as a room in an houſe conſiſteth of, and ſo (in that ſenſe) may
be ſaid to partake of part of the matter, and part of the
form of the whole, not as a *ſpecies*, but as a member of the
houſe.

A ſecond miſtake of my meaning is, that he conceiveth I ac-
counted the Jewiſh Church the Catholike Church, becauſe I de-
fin'd the Church-Catholike to be *the whole company of beleevers*
in the whole world. p.263. And thereupon undertakes to prove
that the Church was *in populo Iſraelitico*, and not *in populo Ca-*
tholico. But this never came into my thoughts: but I acknow-
ledge the Jews to be a national Church. But my deſcription
of the Church-Catholike was of the Church as it is now, ſince
the partition wall is broken down, for then it became Catho-
like. I conceive there were beleevers of the ſonnes of *Keturah*,

Chap. 4.

that did not partake of all the priviledges of the Jewish Church, except they became profelytes. It is the Evangelical Catholike Church which my Question is about ; into which the Jews themselves, being converted, were admitted by a new initial seal, viz. Baptism, and did not stand in it by their former national membership, but received a Catholike membership by baptism.

And hereupon he undertakes to make out my method of conveyance of the right of Church-priviledges to crosse Gods method. He sets down my method thus. First, when a man is converted to the profession of the Gospel, and so becomes a visible beleever, he is then a member of the Church-Catholike. 2. He hath by this profession and membership with the Church-Catholike right unto all Church-priviledges, 3. He then becomes a member of a particular Church, but hath no right to Church-priviledges because of that, but because of his former membership with the Church-Catholike.

I shall own this method rightly understood, though they were not my words, but only collected out of them. I conceive that a man of any Nation converted to be a visible beleever, is a member of the Church-Catholike entirive, being within the general external Covenant : and hereby hath right to all Church-priviledges, that belong to the whole Church, and that his particular membership which he comes to next, doth not afford him his right but opportunity only.

But when M. Hooker comes to shew how this crosseth Gods method, he only sheweth that it crosseth the method that God used in the national Church of the Jews, which being *in populo Israelitico* must needs differ from the method *in populo Catholico*. A person being a visible beleever must join himself to the Jewish Church before he can partake of their priviledges, because the priviledges by Gods Covenant were so given, but now the Covenant is Catholike, it is sufficient to be in the general Covenant to make a man have right to the priviledges of the Covenant; opportunity indeed cometh by joyning himself with some particular Congregations, where the Ordinances are administred, or some particular priviledges, but not the general.

For my part therefore I conceive and conclude, that the

Church-Catholike visible is *Totum integrale*, and the particular Sect. 5. Churches are *partes similes*, or members thereof and parcels thereof. As the Jewish Synagogues were of the Jewish Church, though with some more priviledge for both Sacraments. And therefore *1am. 2. 2.* the Apostle calleth a Christian Assembly a Synagogue, in the Greek. *If there come into your Synagogue a man with a gold ring.* And *Heb. 10. 23.* The Apostle calls their assembling in Christian Congregations *ἐκκλησιαστικὴν*, a coming together into a Synagogue. So, *Tylenus in Syntag. de Eccl. dis. 1 Theol. 3.* *Quamvis Ecclesia nomen usitatum sit pro Christiano caeu, quàm Synagoga; tamen ne hanc quidem appellationem respicit Scriptura. Cum enim utriusq; Testamenti Ecclesia, una eademque sit, secundum essentiam; uno eodemque nomine utrumque populum indigitare nihil vetat.* Neither am I averse from the opinion of such who make the several Synagogues of the Jews several depending Churches; for they had there the word read and preached, and praier, and there they kept daies of humiliation, and there they had their Officers of the Synagogue, and the dispensation of discipline, even of excommunication, *1oh. 9. 22.* Only the censures were with liberty of appeals, in case of male administration. And they are called by the Psalmist, *the houses of God, Psal. 83. 12.* And the Apostles separated not from them any where, until they persecuted them.

Totum essentiale sive genericum doth not comprise the form of the *species* in it self, but giveth the matter or common nature to the *species*, but the Church-Catholike is made up of the matter and form of the particular Churches conjoined, as a whole house of the particular rooms in it: and the particular Churches have in them, and consist of part of the matter and part of the form of the whole *quoad statum externum*. And these parts are limited and distinguished from others by prudential limits for convenience of meeting and maintenance, and transacting of businesse: and every Christian is or ought to be a member of the Church in whose limits he dwels, being already in the general Covenant by baptism. I do not hold (as *M. Hooker* conceives from my words) that meer cohabitation divolveth a Church-membership upon a man, for then a Heathen, Turk or Jew, should be a Church member, if cohabiting with a Church.

Chap. 4.

Church: but I expressed the condition of being baptized, and so in the general Covenant, and then he ought to associate with the Church where God layeth out his habitation, and they ought not to refuse him, except there be sufficient cause of censure. For of any Christians dwelling in any city or Town, where there was a Church, and he not to be a member of that Church, or to be a member of another Church in another Town or City, and reside in his own but *per accidens* (as some distinguish) hath neither example nor warrant in the Scripture. And must imply either that he holdeth them not to be a Church and so not of the Kingdom of Christ, or else such a corrupt part that he dares not joyn himself with them. And as a man that comes to dwell in a Town ought not to refuse to be a member of that town, but shall be ruled by the Officers thereof in civil affairs, and if he like not, he may, yea must remove from them, if he will not submit himself; and if he continue with them, he will be liable to punishment or restraint, by those civil Officers, if there be just cause: so I conceive If any professed subject of Christs Kingdom shall sit down, and cohabit with a Church within the civil limits allotted for such a Congregation, he not only ought to associate with them, but the Officers of that Church ought to take the inspection of him, and if he be dangerously heretical or prophane, and thereby dangerous and offensive, they ought to take care of his cure, and the preservation of the rest of their members, by censuring of him, whether he will or no, in regard of his habitual general membership, and their habitual indefinite office. And though civil prudential limits, wherein a Congregation dwells, give no formality to the Church being heterogeneous, yet as the limits of the particular seas, and their names, are from the shoars and lands they are bounded by, though heterogeneous: so may particular Churches well be bounded and denominated by their civil limits. We finde frequently in Scripture, the Church which was at *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, and *Cenchrea*. And so it is in *New-England*, the several Churches are limited and named by the precincts, and names of the civil divisions of Towns. The Christians of *Boston* associated together make the Church of *Boston*: if there be any not associated,

yet it is their duty to joyn, and they ought to be received, except Sect. 1.
as I said before.

CHAP. V.

That the Church-Catholike is visible.

I now proceed to prove the Church-Catholike to be *visible*, Sect. 1.
which is the thing so much denied by many Divines. There is indeed an invisible Church of Christ, and that Catholike, but if you take Catholike for Orthodoxal, and also for universal, and that in the largest sense of all, comprehending all places and all times, both past, present, and to come, some militant, some triumphant, for whose sakes principally Christ died, and the Ordinances were given, and the visible Church was instituted. Which invisible company are only known to God, and are given by the Father to Christ to redeem and save. And these persons though they be visible in their generations, and enjoy visible communion in the visible Church, whereof they are ordinarily visible members, yet besides that they have invisible grace, and invisible communion with Christ their head, by faith on their parts and the Spirit on his part, and only these shall be saved: yet that is not the Church that is meant in this question, but the external Church of Christ consisting of true believers and hypocrites; in which sense the Scripture oft takes the word Church, I say, the external, political body and kingdom of Christ, as M. Hooker calls it.

The same Church which Vallo Massalinus, or Salmasius, Apollonius, Spanhemius, and Cameron de regimine Ecclesie, and Polanus de Ecclesia visibili universali, and M. Rutherford, M. Richard Hooker, and M. Parker, and divers others, mean in their tractates of this nature, wherein hypocrites as well as true believers are partakers of external Ordinances of worship and discipline. And of this Church it is that Cameron saith, *Non negamus simpliciter Ecclesiam esse visibilem, quæstio est quomodo sit visibilis, quatenus, quando, & quibus.* Cam. de consp. Ec. p. 248.
And

Chap: 4.

And he addeth that this visibility rather sheweth, *Quid sit Ecclesia, quàm qua sit.*

Now visible is that which may be seen, *Visibile est quod videri potest*, i. e. that which hath a capableness in it self to be seen: herein it differs from *visum*, for that is that which is actually seen. Now as *Cameron* and others of this subject do distinguish, things may be said to be visible either *per se & primario*, and so only light and colour are visible, or else *per accidens*, and so figure, magnitude, motion, and all other things, which we say are visible are seen: a man is not seen *per se*, but *per accidens*. The second kinde of visibility is meant in this question, *viz. per accidens & per effecta*, as all other societies are visible.

Secondly, a thing may be said to be visible, either *distinctè* or *confusè*. The Church-Catholike is visible in the second sense, which *Cameron* also granteth, p. 246. And *aliquatenus, aliquando, & aliquo modo, & aliquibus*, p. 247.

Thirdly, a thing may be said to be visible either *uno intuitu, & simul*; or *secundum partes*, at several aspects. The first way only one side of a thing can be seen, *viz.* one plain, and small superficies. The same man cannot be seen at the same view in all his external parts, nor yet the Sun which is most visible. The Church-Catholike cannot be seen *uno intuitu*, but *secundum partes, sive membra*.

Fourthly, some things are visible only by the eye, and judged of by the common sense; but some other things require an act of the understanding to put those visible parts together, to apprehend the unity thereof. The unity of a man or a tree the very beault can discern, but the unity of a society or Kingdom, though it be visible, they cannot discern, because they want understanding to put the parts together.

And in this last sense the Church-Catholike is said to be visible, as a Kingdom or Empire is: the eye and common sense alone cannot discern the unity of it, but there is requisite an act of the understanding to put the visible parts together in apprehension. No man will deny an Empire to be visible, because he cannot see the union of it with his eyes.

Again, I did not take visible in the strictest sense, *visibile est quod radiat per medium, ut luminosum, & coloratum*, but for that

which

which is perceptible by any of the senses, yea, to the perceiving Sect. 2.
of which there is required an act of the understanding also, to conceive of it, and put the parts together, yet not by logical abstraction, but mental apposition and conjunction, as we must do to perceive the unity of a Kingdom. The nearer the parts lie, the more is the visibility; and the further off, the lesse. A Congregation is more visible (in this sense) then a National Church, and a National then the Oecumenical. The more visible the *copula* or bond is, the more visible the thing is.

Having shewed you what Church-Catholike is visible, and how the Church-Catholike may be said to be visible; I come to prove by arguments that it is visible or perceptible. But indeed the difficulty lyeth not here, but in the integrality, for if the Church-Catholike be an integral, it will easily appear to be a visible one.

First, If the subject matter, the persons of whom the Church-Catholike doth consist, be visible, the whole Church is visible also: But they are all visible: Therefore so is the whole Church. Sect. 2.

That the whole Church consisteth of men and women who are visible beleevers (not visible as men, but as beleevers also) none will deny. That the visibility of the whole will necessarily follow, is as undeniably true, for what makes a thing visible, but the visibility of the materials? The essential forms of the most visible things are not visible, as of a stone, or a man. Nothing can be said to be invisible, whose materials are visible.

Secondly, If the conversion into the whole Church be visible, then the whole Church is visible. But the conversion is visible. Therefore, &c.

That conversion into the visible Church is visible, none can deny. The Apostles made a visible conquest of the world by their preaching. They were charged by *Demetrius* to have turned the world upside down, Act. 17.6. They turn'd men from *Idols*, to serve the living and true God, 1 Thes. 1.9. That this conversion was not into a particular Congregation, but into the external visible body and kingdom of Christ, is as clear; and the gathering them into particular Congregations, and setting El-
O ders

Chap. 5.

ders over them was a second work. And the consequence will follow, for such as the conversion is, such is the Church into which they are converted; visible conversion makes no man a member of the invisible body, but of the visible only, invisible grace is required for that.

Thirdly, If the profession, subjection, obedience, and conversation of the members of the whole Church be visible, then the whole Church is visible. But they are visible. Therefore, &c.

The assumption none will deny. It is called a *professed subjection*, 2 Cor. 9. 13. And Rom. 16. 19. *Your obedience is come a broad unto all. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works*, Mat. 5. 16. It is toward God in duties of the first table, and towards men in duties of the second, in charity, chastity, equity, truth, humility, meeknesse. Phil. 1. 27. 2 Pet. 3. 17. yea, visible to them that are without, 2 Pet. 3. 11. Now what reference hath this profession, subjection, obedience, conversation to the particular Congregations? Do they professe, subject themselves to the laws of Christ, and yield obedience thereunto in a godly conversation, because they are members of this or that particular Congregation, or because they are entred into the general Covenant, whereby they are made subjects and members of Christs Kingdom? Is the particular confederation the ground and cause of their profession, subjection, obedience, and godly conversation? Were not these found in them before they were thought meet to be entred into the particular confederation? were they not judged to be subjects to Christ, and visible members of his body, and in external Covenant, before their admittance? How then could that be the ground thereof? Indeed there are some particular duties and priviledges which relate in an especial manner to the particular Congregation, and a particular unity of a particular Church, as a member of the whole body resulteth therefrom, but not the general duties, priviledges, or membership.

Suppose a man be a freeman of some Corporation, as *Sp-swich*, though thereby he hath the priviledges of the particular Corporation belonging to him, and particular duties belong-

ing

ing to the Corporation are required of him, and he requires Sect. 2.
and receiveth the priviledge of a subject, the execution of the
laws of the Kingdom there; yet he must be conceived a mem-
ber of the Kingdom, before he can be admitted a free man of
the Corporation, and he receives the general priviledges, and
performs the general duties, in reference to that, and not in
reference to the particular Corporation, and his membership
thereof; though he hath the opportunity of enjoying the one,
and performance of the other, in that particular society. And
yet this doth not make the Kingdom a *Genus*, and the Corpo-
ration a *Species* thereof, but the kingdom an integral, and the
Corporation a member thereof. So is the case between the
whole Church and the particular. Yet with this difference, all
the particular Churches are similar parts of the whole Church,
so are not all Corporations, nor all villages, they differ some-
times in kindes of Officers, sometimes in particular immuni-
ties.

Also the similarity of the parts of the whole Church, gives the
same denomination to the particular Churches with the whole,
the particular Congregation is called a Church as well as the
whole, whereas no particular Corporation is called a King-
dom: and this is the cause why the particular Churches are deem-
ed to be *species*, whereas indeed they are members of the whole,
viz. because of the identity of denomination, but identity of de-
nomination or similarity of parts, are not sufficient to make a
genus and *species*, especially where the whole is constituted by
an external Covenant.

4. If the Officers which Christ hath given to the whole
Church, be visible, then so is the Church. But the Officers are vi-
sible. Therefore, &c.

That the Officers are visible none will deny, because they are
visibly called, ordained, and execute their office visibly. That
visible Officers argue a visible polity, is as clear, such as the Offi-
cers are (in respect of visibility or invisibility) such is the King-
dom. That the ministry is given to the whole Church, as the Le-
vites were to all *Israel*, and that they are all Officers of the whole
habitual, and habitually have power to dispense the Ordinances
of Christ in any part of the whole Church upon a call, shall be
proved, c. 6. s. 4.

Chap. 5.

5. If the admittance into the whole Church, and ejection out of it be visible, then the whole Church is visible. But admittance by Baptism, ejection by excommunication are visible. Therefore, &c.

That admittance and ejection being publike acts before the whole Congregation, are visible, none will deny. That such as the admittance or ejection is (in regard of visibility) such is the society or polity, is as clear. That the admittance is into the whole, and ejection out of it, hath been proved already, and shall more fully afterward. Either by Baptism men are admitted into the particular Church, or the whole Church, or no Church: but not into the particular Congregation, no man is baptized into the particular Congregation, it is not the seal of the particular Covenant: therefore it is into the whole or none. If a heathen be converted in a Congregation, first he receives baptism, afterward is admitted a member of the particular confederation.

Sect. 3.

6. If the Doctrine, Laws, Ordinances, Charter, and Covenant of the whole Church, be visible, then so is the whole Church. But they are visible. Therefore, &c.

That the Doctrine, Laws, Ordinances, Charter, and Covenant of the whole Church are visible, none will deny, for they may be seen, read, preached, and heard. That they belong to, and constitute the whole, is as undeniable. Of the same nature that the laws, and charter of a kingdom is (in respect of visibility) of the same nature is the kingdom. Now it is not the invisible law of nature written in the heart, that constitutes the visible Church, for the heathens have that, *Rom. 2. 15.* nor is it the invisible law of grace, promised to be written in Gods peoples hearts, *Jer. 31. 33.* for many members of the visible Church have not that; but it is the visible systeme of laws, and Covenant given by Christ to his visible Church.

And these Laws, Charter, and Covenant are the very *copula* or bond of the external body and kingdom of Christ, and thereby they are bound to worship and discipline. Now *where the copula or bond uniting visible parts together, is visible, there the whole is visible, But the copula or bond is visible,*

Therefore

Therefore so is the Whole. A visible bond cannot unite invisible Sect. 3. members.

Against this it is objected by M. Hooker, That divers several kingdoms may be governed by the same laws, and yet remain several kingdoms.

Ans. It is true, it is possible that all the kingdoms of the earth may submit to, and be governed by the same systeme of laws, and many now are by the civil law, and yet remain several. But they arise not from the same fountain, the same King or Governours, nor binde not in subjection and obedience unto the same King, nor to mutual duties of subjects between themselves as fellow-subjects: but are embraced *vi materia* or *forma*, because found convenient, and receive a several stamp of authority from the several States or Governours, whereby they are obliging in the several kingdoms. But these laws proceed from the same fountain, the same Lord Jesus, the king of the whole, and are obliging from the same authority to all Christians in the whole world, therefore they are one visible Church or kingdom mystical. If the whole Church be a *Genus*, it is constituted and united together by a visible external Covenant and Laws, which is not consistent with the nature of a *Genus* as a *Genus*.

7. If all the administrations and dispensations, and operations of the whole Church be visible, so is the whole Church: But they are all visible. Therefore, &c.

That they are all visible (being publickly done) none will deny.

Obj. But these administrations, dispensations, and operations are acted in the several Congregations, and are not actions of the whole Church.

Ans. So is justice administred at Assizes and Sessions in several Counties and Corporations, but is it the justice of the whole, because it is administred by the same laws, and by the same authority, and is common to all the subjects of the kingdom? A man dwelling in any part of the kingdom being tried at *Suffolk* Assizes may receive his sentence and execution there, if guilty. So all Church-administrations are by the same laws, and upon the same command; and persons of any Church in the world may hear

Chap. 5.

hear, sing, pray, and communicate any where indefinitely upon occasion, though constantly the particular members only enjoy those particular administrations from those particular Officers.

I answer further, that the Church-Catholike may act visibly by their delegates (as a Kingdom in a Parliament) in a general Council, if they can convene: though their power were wholly consultatory and suafory (as some pleade) but it is more. All their debates, arguings *pro & con*, all their advice and decrees are visible: therefore the whole whose delegates they are, is visible also. The invisible Church (as invisible) send none.

8. If it be our duty to joyn our selves visibly to the Church-Catholike, then it is visible: But we ought to joyn our selves to the Church-Catholike. Therefore, &c.

The Assumption none will deny. As soon as the 3000. were converted by *Peter*, they were added to the Church. Christians may not stand alone independently. Now that must be a visible Church that we must joyn unto, for the invisible is within the visible, and cannot be known. God commands no impossibilities. It is true indeed we must joyn to some particular Congregation (as a forreigner coming over into *England* to inhabit, being naturalized, must dwell in some particular Town) but to that Congregation as a member of the whole, wherein we may enjoy the general priviledges of subjects of Christ first, and the particular priviledges of that Congregation secondarily. There is no particular command to joyn to this or that particular Congregation, but the whole; necessity compelleth to choose one. Our particular joyning to this or that Congregation is not in obedience to the command, for then, had we joyned to another we had broken a command, therefore that is arbitrary and limited by civil habitation necessarily.

9. If the accidents of the whole Church be visible, then so is the whole Church. But there be visible accidents of the whole Church. Therefore, &c.

An invisible subject hath not visible accidents. But so hath the whole Church, as beauty, strength, order, amplitude, which may encrease or decrease, and these are accidents of the whole
arising

arising and resulting from all the parts conjoynd, and made up of the beauty, strength, order, and amplitude of all the parts. Sect. 4.

Also there may be general, visible opposition against the whole Church, not because in particular confederation, but the general. These persecutors are visible, their actions are visibly managed, by attachments, prisons, fire and faggot: their effects visible: fines, imprisonments, confiscation, banishment and death: and therefore the object hereof, the whole Church, must needs be visible also. And all this meerly because they belong to Christ, and have given up their names to him. And because they will not visibly run to the same excess of riot, or worship the same Idols that they do.

10. If the parts of the whole Church be visible, so is the whole, But the parts of the whole Church are visible. Therefore, &c.

By parts I mean not the particular persons only, but particular Congregations. Now none deny the particular Churches to be visible, neither our brethren for Congregational Churches, nor yet the separation. And Gerard though he will not grant the Church Catholike to be visible, yet saith, *Ecclesias particulares visibiles esse concedimus*, The consequence will necessarily follow, for the visibility of the whole results out of the visibility of the parts. An innumerable number of visible parts cannot make an invisible whole.

Against this M. Ellis vind. 59. alledgeth that it is too lax a medium in so weighty a subject as this is. "There is (saith he) Sect. 4.
" great difference between natural and metaphysical, or civil and
" politic bodies. For in a natural body all whose parts and mem-
" bers are actually and naturally joyned together, the whole is vi-
" sible, because the parts are visible: but in a metaphysical body or
" totum or whole, that is in Generals, that are by the reason of
" man drawn from particulars, the case is far otherwise. Peter,
" James, and John are visible, but manhood which is the universal
" agreeing to them all, is not visible. This being the same with my
" first Objection I set down in my Thesis, one answer shall serve for
" both.

Ans. M. Ellis knows I took not the Church-Catholike for
a Genus.

Chap. 5.

a *Genus*, but an Integral. But let it be supposed a *Genus* for argument sake, or as M. Hooker calls it, *Totum genericum existens*, which is something fairer then M. Ellis's grant; for by M. Ellis's reasoning the Church-Catholike should be a *Genus* drawn by the reason of man, and so existing only in *intellectu nostro*. I say, suppose the Church-Catholike to be a *Genus*, and the particular Churches *Species*, yet this is not sufficient to make the Church-Catholike to be invisible. Will any man say, that *Animal est substantia invisibilis*, because it existeth only in *homine & bruto*? Indeed animality in the abstract is invisible, but not animal in concreto: so *Ecclesiæ* (as I may say) is invisible, but *Ecclesia* is visible. Visibility is an accident belonging primarily to a higher *Genus* then animal, viz. *Corpus coloratum*, and though every Individual animal is visible, as John and James, yet not quâ John or James but as coloured bodies: and if a higher *Genus* be visible, which is nearer *Ens*, and further from *Individuals*, then much more animal. So in this case the Church-Catholike is a society of men, and that M. Ellis denyeth not; now every society of men is visible, and therefore the Church which is a *species* of society must needs be so also, for the visibility doth not betide it, because it is a particular Congregation, but because it is a society of men, which is a higher *Genus*: I mean this in a logical consideration.

Then he proceeds to deny a civil body or Corporation, if great, "as an Empire, Kingdom, or large city, to be seen in it self, but in the parts.

Answ. Here he confounds *visibile* and *visum uno intuitu*: and by this reasoning he should deny the visibility of the world, or any particular man, for all his parts cannot be seen *uno intuitu*. *Attamen insaniat qui neget se videre hominem*, saith Cameron. Yea, the sun it self should not be visible by this reasoning, because we can see but the surface of it. He could not be ignorant that I did not mean that the Church-Catholike was actually seen *uno intuitu*.

And whereas I had said the whole is visible, because the parts are so. He saith it is untrue even in the smallest bodies, but where the parts are actually united together, not where they are thousands of miles asunder.

Answ.

Ans. It is true indeed in natural and artificial bodies, whose being or integrality consisteth in a corporeal continuity, or contiguity of parts; for if that continuity or contiguity ceaseth, the integral also ceaseth, except in *potentia*. Sect. 4.

But in political bodies joyned together by laws, under one government, it is otherwise; the distance of place hinders not the integrality of the whole, and though it cannot be seen *uno intuitu*, by the same man at once (unlesse by way of representation, as in a Parliament or Common-Council, as M. Ellis saith) nor yet be perceived to be one without some act of the understanding, yet this maketh not the City or Empire invisible.

He confesseth the Church-Catholike to be visible in respect of the severall parts, and places where they dwell: but this (saith he) is to prevaricate, and to prove that which is not in question. But he might remember that I took visible in the explication of the terms of the question, to be meant in regard of visible communion in holy Ordinances, though the persons never congregate into one place, to be seen with one mans eye; but in opposition to inward invisible communion. Let him grant but such a visibility of the Church-Catholike as was in any of the four Monarchies, or a civil kingdom, which yet are seen but in their severall parts and places, and I contend for no more. I suppose no particular Congregation was ever seen together, in all the members thereof, *uno intuitu*: and yet is visibly one in regard of the particular confederation, and usual meeting of most of the members. Is not *England* a visible Kingdom, though seen but in the parts of it? was it not visible before there was a Parliament to represent it, or doth it cease to be visible in the intervals of Parliaments? The visibility of it consisteth in the visibility of the Persons, Corporations, Places, Laws, Government. So is the case of the Church-Catholike whose Persons, Places, Laws (which are the visible bond) and government are as external and visible as those of the Kingdom, *i. e.* lyable to sense, and perceivable by sense, though not actually seen by the same man at once.

I desire it might be noted that the Church-Catholike which our Divines speak of in their disputes against the Papists, is not this

Chap. 5.

this Church-Catholike which we have now in hand, but that is the whole Church or company of the elect, both past, present, and to come. It is the Church taken in the first sense, in the explication of the terms of the Question, not the external, political, mixed Church or kingdom of Christ. Neither doth that Church agree with this, but only nominally and equivocally, in that it is called by the same name, but it is not the same in nature or sense: and therefore should that and this be used in a syllogism, there would be 4 terms. For that Church is neither external, nor visible, nor existent, nor organical, it hath no Officers, it is no polity: it is not that which M. Hooker calls *Totum genericum existens*: for many of them are already in heaven, and the spirits of just men made perfect, many not yet born, many not yet converted.

Now to make that the *Genus* of the visible, external, political Churches of Christ, were as absurd as to make the vessels of gold to be the *Genus* of the silver, brazen, pewter, wooden, stony and earthen vessels of a house, or a marble building to be the *Genus* of all the buildings of other stones, brick and timber. And therefore to dispute from that to this, is not *ad idem*. I suppose that neither M. Hooker nor M. Ellis meant that Church, no more then I.

If the *genus* comprehend only invisible members, the *Species* should be only of invisible members also. The *genus* is of the same nature or predicament with the *Species*, and all that is common to all the *Species* is found in the *genus*, and fetched from thence. There is nothing in man, but it is in *animal*, except the specifical form, whereby he differs from a brute, and nothing in *animal* but it is in man, except its totality or generality, whereby it comprehends man and brute. If *homo* and *brutum* be visible living substances, they received it from *animal*.

The *genus* giveth essence to the *species*, and is *symbolum causa materialis*: but the Church of the Elect giveth not essence, nor matter to the visible Church: for there are many members of this which are not invisible: neither are the elect members of this, *quâ* invisible, but *quâ* existent and visible. The visible and invisible Church are contra-distinct branches of a distribution *ex adjunctis, vel modo communionis*, therefore the one cannot be

be the *genus* of the other; for then the *genus* and *species* should Sect. 4.
not be of the same general predication or denomination; but
the invisible should be *genus* of the visible; one branch be *genus*
of the other, which is contrary to all Logick.

The invisibility of this *genus* ariseth not from a separation of
the invisible members from the visible, or the sheep from the
goats, but ariseth from a mental abstraction; it is the invisibility
of a notion, not of the persons: It is not by culling out such as
have invisible grace, and leaving the rest; for that which is so cul-
led out, is not comprehensive of them both. The *Genus* drawn
by logical, mental abstraction from the most corporeal, visible
substances, is as invisible, *quâ genus*, as a *genus* of incorporeal, in-
visible substances.

Either that Church-Catholike which our Divines speak of, is
the *Genus* of particular visible Churches, or it is not. If it be,
then it must be an external visible polity (in general notion)
which must comprehend all the external, visible, Ecclesiasti-
cal Polities on earth; and so hypocrites as well as the elect.
The *species* consist of such matter, and therefore so must the
genus, in the notion, I mean: but that they deny of their Church-
Catholike visible.

If it be not: then it is not the Church-Catholike which
M. Hooker and M. Ellis intend; for they intend a general Church
which comprehends in notion all the visible Churches under it.
And therefore they differ from our Divines in their meaning
of the Church-Catholike, as much as I do; And so joyn not, nor
concur with our Divines in the same subject, neither is it *ad idem*.

Now if we make the Church-Catholike an abstract, general
notion, comprehending all particular Churches under it as a
genus, then we make Christs visible, external Kingdom on earth,
only a logical, non-existing notion; and the particular Congre-
gations to be the several *species* of the kingdom of Jesus Christ,
all comprehended under one logical, comprehensive notion;
and the particular Covenant or confederation of such or such
a company between themselves, should constitute a kingdom of
Jesus Christ. And so when a man removes from one Congre-
gation into another, he should remove out of one *species* into
another: and in the *interim* be quite out of the kingdom of

Chap. 5.

Christ; because he is out of all the *species* of Christs kingdom, and a particular member cannot exist under this *genus*, for it is a *genus* of Congregations, *quæ* Congregations, and not of single persons. And then it will follow, that many a visible beleever shall be no member of Christs visible external kingdom; or else that after he is a visible existing subject of Christs kingdom, he may choose which *species* of Christs kingdom he will exist in; and that is as absurd, as if there should be an existing *animal*, that will choose whether he will be a man or a brute: who seeth not that there is a visible existence of many a visible beleever, who is a subject of Christs visible kingdom, before he be admitted into any of those Congregations, which are (by this opinion accounted) *species*. Now if we account the particular Churches members of Christs Kingdom, it is not absurd for any subject of Christ, to choose which part of Christs kingdom, or which Ecclesiastical Corporation he will dwell in or adhere unto, for the actual enjoyment of the Priviledges, Laws, and Ordinances of Christs Kingdom: no more then for a subject of a King to choose in what part of the Kingdom he will dwell. The Kingdom of *England* though a political body, yet containeth under, or in it, not only all Corporations and villages, but all single persons, that are subject to the King and Laws, though they be not fixed, and though they want by their unfixednesse the particular priviledges of the particular Towns they might have inhabited, and so the actual opportunity of enjoyment of the benefit of the Laws administred in such Corporations or Counties, yet have an habitual right to the general priviledges, by being subjects: so have unfixed members of Christs external Kingdom, which reacheth single visible subjects as well as combined. Nay, a man may better make the kingdom of *England* a *Genus*, and all the Corporations and villages *species* thereof, because they are many of them distinct and different in their constitutions, then the Church-Catholike a *Genus*, and the particular Congregations *species*, which are of one constitution. And if *totum genericum existens*, can have any sense put upon it, it will agree to the Kingdom of *England* (or any other kingdom) for it consisteth of a sort of men (*viz.* English-men) existing in several Counties and Towns: but as that notion hinders not the

integrality

integrality of the Kingdom; so no more it will the Church-Ca- Sect. 5.
tholike visible.

Obj. Yea, but the Church-Catholike cannot be visible because Sect. 5.
it wants an existence of its own; and existeth only in the existence
of the particular Churches, the members thereof.

Ans. Where there are existing visible members, there must
be an existing visible Integral. *Omne membrum habet suum in-*
tegrum.

The same Objection lyeth as well against any aggregative
body. A heap of stones may as well be said to exist only in the
existence of the particular stones, and a particular Congrega-
tion exist in the existence of the particular families, and parti-
cular families exist in the particular persons. But if the mem-
bers exist *quæ* members, the existence of the integral re-
sults out of their conjoynd existence, and so doth the visi-
bility.

An army existeth in the several brigades, and regiments,
and they are billeted or quartered in distant places, and yet
having the same General, the same Laws martial, the same
cause, the same enemies, although they should never be drawn
up together in one body at one place, yet are they one visible
Army. So is the Church-Catholike one, and that visibly (as I
shewed in the beginning of this Chapter) though there goeth
an act of the minde to the perceivance of the unity. It is a po-
litical union by the same visible Charter, and laws, and way,
under one Commander in chief, and therefore visible, *i. e.* per-
ceivable by sense though not by sense only, the very uniting
bond, the laws are visible: yea, the existence of it will more
appear, because it hath priviledges belonging thereunto, which
particulars have not, or but in part, and at second hand, as hath
been shewed in the former Chapt. and shall more fully in the
second Question.

This Objection M. Ellis vind. p. 36. undertakes to set down,
and marks it in the margin, as if he had cited my words, but mis-
seth both my words and sense.

And then fals upon the Answer, and saith, that "it amounts
"not to an answer, for no collected body that is made up of se-
"veral things, hath its being in these things severally consi-

Chap. 5.

"dered and apart, but as united altogether, it is not an heap of
 "stones, if one lie at *York*, some at *London*, others in *France*,
 "Spain, &c.

I answer, It is true, in bodies made up by physical or artificial
 aggregation, there must indeed be some contiguity or nearness
 of parts; but in political aggregation (and such *M. Ellis* ac-
 knowledgeth, *vind.* p. 5. l. 38.) it is not necessary. *M. Ellis* makes
 the Empire of *Germany* one by aggregation; and yet hath not
 (I suppose) cast those several territories one upon another;
 as the Giants are feigned to throw *Pelion* upon *Ossa*; but they
 ly further distant then at *M. Calamies* door, and *M. Hudsons*;
 as he is pleased to make the allusion, or illusion rather, *vin.* p. 35.
 One Kingdom may consist of divers Ilands, if under the same
 King, and laws, &c. and so may all the Churches in the world
 be one Church, though farre distant; and visible, though not
 actually seen, because the persons and places are visible, and the
 things wherein, and whereby they are conjoyned, as Profession,
 Laws, Doctrine, Seals, Worship, &c. are external, and so visible.
 And though an aggregative body is not made up of the several
 parts considered severally and apart, yet out of the existence, and
 visibility of them conjoyned, either physically or politically, &c.
 (according as the thing is) the existence and visibility of the
 whole will result, as I said before.

And Sir, I cannot but right my self from an injury which in
 your answer to this Objection, *vind.* p. 24. you offered me: by
 intimating bitingly, to delude your reader, and wrong *M. Ca-*
lamy (the licenser of that Thesis) as if he were the Authour of
 it, or partly the Authour, or at the fairest the inciter thereto.
 What other construction can these words of you bear? *A man-*
midwife may be father also. And another jerk you give to the
 same purpose, *vind.* p. 80. in these words *Moses mother was his*
nurse also. But Sir, that which is mine I am not willing should
 be charged upon any other; I owned it in print; and to put
 you and others out of doubt, I assure you that neither *M. Ca-*
lamy nor any other incited me thereto, neither so much as
 made or altered one sentence in the whole Thesis. Neither was
 it of such a texture as that you or any man else, should suppose
 it had any other Authour or Authours, then a mean Countrey-
 Minister,

Minister, such as I acknowledge my self to be. You might have Sect. 5.
known who was the Authour thereof, if you would have
been pleased to have come to our company, at the reading of
it, as you were lovingly invited, out of desire to enjoy your
society, for the learning and piety we conceived to be in you.

Obj. If the Church-Catholike or Oecumenical be one visible
Church, it is necessary that they should all meet together at
some times.

Ans. It is not at all necessary, neither to the unity, nor yet
to the visibility of the Church. It is sufficient that the persons
be visible in their several places, and that they be combined
together under the same head, by visible laws and profession,
under the same visible seal and enrowment, walk visibly in the
same godly conversation before men, pray one for another, as
fellow-members, rejoyce in the wel-fare, and mourn for the
ill-fare one of another, and contribute assistance one to an-
other, as occasion is offered. As therefore it is not need-
ful to the unity or visibility of a kingdom or Empire, that
they should meet together sometimes: so is it not needful
for the whole Church: indeed there may be some conveni-
ency in both, *ad bene, vel optimum esse, sed non adesse simpli-*
citer.

This *M. Ellis* excepteth against, *vin. p. 55.* First, he asketh whe-
ther ever there were such a kingdom in the world, that the
members did not meet sometimes, if it be not a meer visible
monarchy, as under Popery. If there be any liberty left to the
Subjects, &c.

Ans. Let him shew that ever the four Monarchies did meet
together respectively, either in their persons or deputies, or
delegates from every Province, yet that hindered not their u-
nity nor visibility. And his answer implyeth, that the Eccle-
stical Monarchy under Popery did never meet. He makes it
but a sign of liberty to meet, not a sign of visibility. And for
the point of liberty inherent in the subjects as their proper
right, distinct from what is derived and given by Christ as their
head, there was never any Monarchy so meerly depending on
the will of the Monarch, as the Church-visible on Christ, for
the Church deriveth all its power from Christ, and hath all its

Chap. 5.

laws given and imposed only by Christ, without any vote of the Churches in the making of them. It is probable that the kingdoms under the four Monarchies had some enjoyment of their municipal laws, only might have some imperial general laws superadded: but it is not so in this, for the whole Church (as a Church) hath no laws, but of Christs arbitrary donation. Christians are not subdued by Christ as Englishmen were by *William the Conquerour*, viz. on condition that he would suffer them to enjoy their former rights, and the Laws of *Edward the Confessor*, but absolutely to receive Laws from him: And yet this can neither be thought tyranny in Christ, nor yet slavery in us, for Christs Laws are more beneficial to us, then any of our own making, and his service is perfect freedom.

And yet we reade of general Councils of the Church by their delegates, which were as it were a ministerial Church-Catholike: which in former times of the Church under Christian Emperours were frequent; and there is no intrinsecal let in the Church that they do not meet so still, but only extrinsecal, and extraneous, by reason of the divisions among the civil Governours: but even in our daies a great part of that great body hath met, as in the Synod of *Dort*, &c. by Commissioners.

D. Whitakers and *Apollonius* acknowledge the meeting, *Act. 1.* to be a general Council. The members were the Apostles, who were Pastours of the Church-Catholike, and brethren out of *Galilee* and *Jerusalem*. The work was to elect an Apostle, who was to be a Pastor of the universal Church: and they that undertake and dispatch such a businesse which concerns the extraordinary teaching and government of the whole Church, should represent the whole Church-Catholike.

M. Ellis *vin.* p. 25. utterly denyeth that ever there was any general Council which might be said to be the Church-Catholike, viz. ministerially. But I took *general* in the usual sense of it, and not precisely considered. He knows the four Councils are known by the name of The four general Councils. And so himself calls them, *vind.* p. 15. l. 37. I took the term *general* in the sense that we call the four Monarchies, the Monarchies of the whole world,

and yet we know there were many countries that were never Sect. 5.
under them. And as *Luke Act. 2.5.* saith, there were dwelling
at *Jerusalem* Jews, devout men out of every nation under hea-
ven: and yet there were many Nations where Jews never dwelt,
some of which were discovered lately. But let him look into
Euseb. de vita Constantini, lib. 3. and *Socrates Scholast.* lib. 1.
cap. 8. and he shall finde from how many Countries the first
Council of *Nice* was gathered. "There were gathered (saith
"he) together into one, the chief Ministers of God inhabiting
"all the Churches throughout all *Europe, Africk, and Asia.*
"That sacred Synod framed as it were by the handy-work of
"God, received also both Syrians and Cilicians, and such as
"came from *Phanicia, Egypt, Arabia, Palestina, Thebais, Ly-*
"bia, and *Mesopotamia.* There was also in this Synod the Bi-
"shop of *Persis, of Pontus, Galatia, Pamphilia, Cappadocia, Asia,*
"and *Phrygia.*

Moreover the *Thracians, Macedonians, Achaians, Epirotes,*
Also of the *Spaniards* there was an eminent man, ὁ πᾶν βοάμενος,
The Bishop of the imperial city βασιλευσίου πόλεως (*viz. Rome*)
by reason of his old age absented himself, yet there were pre-
sent of his Presbyters, which supplied his room. Divers things
M. *Elia* excepteth against that Council, as some extraordina-
rineesse in the summoning of the members of it, without electi-
on and delegation of the particular Churches. And that *Con-*
stantine was the visible head of it; and that he called for Bi-
shops chiefly, if not only, which will not be pertinent here to
answer. Something there might be extraordinary in the sum-
mons: for the civil and Ecclesiastical State not concurring to-
gether until *Constantine*, haply there could not be a regular e-
lection. In extraordinary times and cases, our brethren will
grant something may be done extraordinarily: as there is in
the calling of this present Assembly, as is acknowledged by
M. *Gillespy.* There were also others besides Bishops and Mi-
nisters. Neither did *Constantine* either sit as President of it,
nor presume to be head: but confesseth himself to be ἐπίσκοπος
τῶν ἔξω not τῶν ἔσω: but by his civil sanction he did confirm
their decrees, and send them abroad. Neither is there any
ground that in that or any other Council, the members acted

Chap. 5.

only each for his own particular Church that sent him (as *M. Ellis* suggesteth) but the whole for the whole, as far as their delegation was.

I acknowledge there is power given to every particular Church to rule it self, and exercise the discipline of the Church for the being and well-being of it ordinarily. Yet so as it is a part of the whole Church, into which also the censures there passed, have influence. And on some great occasions there may be cause to fetch help further, as *Cranmer* appealed to a general Council. But if that extensive power cannot be had, as now it is very difficult; then must the particular, national, provincial, classical, or congregational Church rest in that intensive power that remains within its own limits; or also if they stand so as that they cannot combine with neighbours, or have recourse unto them. Extraordinary cases cannot be regulated by ordinary rules. And this I conceive is the reason why the Scripture hath not determined more particularly the Synodical Assemblies; but only giveth general rules that may be drawn to particulars, because all Churches and seasons are not capable of national or provincial Synods, in regard of many things that may be incident.

In some cases also all civil power must rest in one Congregation, as if it were in a wilderness, where there were no neighbour Towns or cities to which it might be joyned. Yet it followeth not that it must be so in *England*, or any other kingdom, where there are Counties, Shires, Cities, great Towns, or a Parliament. Yea, I know not but a particular family may, yea, must be independent in such an extraordinary case, both in Ecclesiastical and civil matters also: yet it follows not that there is such an inherent right in every town or family all over the world, and that therefore particular Towns and families in *England* are debarred of an inherent priviledge belonging to them, because necessity may put such an Independency on some, in an extraordinary case; as by shipwrack, or being cast into some Island not inhabited.

Here *M. Ellis* chargeth me to say, that the power of a general Council, (or of a Church-Catholike visible) is *but* extensive, and *only* extensive, and not intensive, and the power of

the particular Churches is intensive. But Sir, do as you would be done by. It is not fair dealing to note them as my words which were none of mine, nor my sense. For first, I never conceived a general Council to be the whole Church-Catholike visible, but only an œcumenical, ministerial or representative body of Officers, or Organs of the Church, much lesse the prime Church to which the Ordinances and priviledges of the Church were first given, of which I spake, as appears in my second part. Secondly, I never said the power of a general Council was *only* extensive; for as the particular Officers have intensive power over their particular Congregations, so hath a general Council intensive power also, but their power is larger in extension actually, then the particular Officers is, being Officers sent from a larger part of the Church-Catholike, and intrusted by more, and acting for more then one Congregation, or one Eldership. This distinction M. Parker de polît. Eccl. lib. 3. p. 121. setteth down in these words, "*Distinguo de potestate clavinum, quæ intensiva aut extensiva est. Intensiva potestate caret nulla Ecclesia prima (viz. particularis) minima quidem; extensiva verò ea caret, quam habet Synodus, cum potestas ad plures Ecclesias extenditur.*" And so it neither overthroweth my first nor second tener, as he inferreth.

Sect. 6.

Obj. If there be a Church-Catholike visible here on earth, it is fit it should have a visible head over them, that so the body and head may be of the same nature.

Ans. This was indeed used as a main argument by the Pontificians for the supremacy of the Pope. The avoiding whereof made our Divines so shy of granting a Church-Catholike visible, but it was not necessary that they should deny upon this ground, as M. Hooker conceives, *Surv.* p. 251. I say it is not necessary to grant a visible head to the Church-Catholike visible, no more then to a particular visible Congregation, which our brethren hold to be a body of Christ. And though they call it a mystical and spiritual body, yet that doth not imply it to be invisible. The Sacraments are called mysteries, and mystical, and the Ordinances are called spiritual, and yet are visible, though the grace signified or conveyed by them to the Elect, is invisible. They are spiritual in respect of the author God, and the di-

Chap. 5.

vine subject about which they are, in opposition to natural and civil, and so our Ecclesiastical Courts were called spiritual, though indeed as they managed them they made them carnal and sinful. The members of the particular Congregations are visible members, and their union and confederation is visible; and they are a visible body, mixed of true beleevers and hypocrites, as *Gerard, Whitakers, Cameron*, and even *M. Bartlet* in his model, confesseth. And their communion is visible, and yet there is no visible head on earth required for them, and why then should there be for the Church-Catholike? Such a head therefore, whether visible or invisible, present or absent, as will serve a particular mystical body of Christ, as *M. Cotton* calls a particular visible Congregation, will serve the Church-Catholike visible.

I answer further, that the Church-Catholike visible hath a head of the same nature, consisting of body and soul, who sometimes lived in this visible kingdom of grace, in the daies of his flesh, and did visibly partake in external Ordinances, though indeed now he be ascended into his kingdom of glory, yet ceaseth not to be a man, and so visible in his humanity as we are, though glorified and glorious, yet not lesse visible in himself for that, but rather more: and ceaseth not to rule and govern his Church here below, for it is an *everlasting Kingdom*, *Esay 9. 7.* As when King *James* was translated from *Scotland* to *England*, and lived here, he did not cease to be King of *Scotland*: so neither doth Christ cease to be the head of his Church, though he be translated and ascended to his other kingdom, the kingdom of glory. And as for a Vicar or Deputy here below, it is not needful. We confesse the government of the Church in regard of the head is absolutely Monarchical, but in regard of the Officers, it is Aristocratical.

This second answer is excepted against, both by *M. Ellis vind.* p. 56. and *M. Hooker Sur.* p. 258. "It is insufficient (saith *M. Ellis*) for Christ is head invisible, and thence our Divines affirm his body the Church to be mystical also, and invisible taken properly.

I answer, That Christ is not only head of the invisible company, which headship and body allude to the natural head and bo-

dy, which is indeed the Church in the most proper and prime Sect. 6. sense, but he is head also of the visible company or Ecclesiastical body, in allusion to a civil head or governour.

Christ not only affordeth invisible communion to his invisible members, but externally by Ordinances to both invisible and visible members of the Church, yet to both visibly. For Christ by his Ambassadors, and in his written word speaks externally to their senses, and they speak externally to him in prayer and singing. And as he was once visibly on earth in our nature, a visible head of his Church: so also, if the millenary opinion be true, (which some of this way hold) he shall come again, and shall sit and reign a thousand years visibly. But whether that opinion be true or no (which I much doubt) yet he shall come again visibly, as the Sonne of man, at the end of the world, and take account of the managing of these Ordinances, and of the carriage both of Officers and private Christians, and the elect shall be gathered together into heaven, and enjoy him visibly to all eternity, and he shall visibly condemn the reprobates, and every eye shall see him. So that this is but an interval, wherein Christ though he be now visible in himself, yet appears not to us visibly, ordinarily, though he did to *Paul* and *Steven*, even after his ascension. Yet, now he affords visible communion to his people by his Ordinances, and they do visible service unto him, though he resideth not with them. If the absence of the King make the kingdom invisible, then *Ireland* is an invisible kingdom.

M Hooker affirms this opinion to be not only untrue, but very dangerous, to hold that Christ as meer man consisting of body and soul is a visible head of his Church. And thereupon citeth *Whitakers* words, that Christ did not reside in the Church as a visible Monarch, nor came into the world to set up a visible Monarchy.

Ans. I do not conceive that Christ as meer man consisting of body and soul is the head of the Church, either invisible or political, but as God-man, yet that person was visible, though but in one of his natures, and in but half of that neither, viz. his body. The visibility of one nature makes visibility to be predicated of the whole person, else no man is visible, for his soul

Chap. 5.

is invisible. It is the meanest half of him that is visible, and so no earthly King should be visible. Christ is called *God manifested in the flesh*, 1 Tim. 3. 16. *And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father*, Joh 1. 14. *We were eye-witnesses of his majesty*, 1 Pet. 1. 16. *That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life*. 1 Joh. 1. 1. I hope these speeches are neither untrue nor dangerous. And for his donative power and authority, Christ saith of himself, Joh. 5. 27. *that the Father hath given authority to execute judgement because he is the son of man, The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sinnes*, and that was a kingly action. And the Apostle saith Act. 17. 31. *God hath appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained*. It is true indeed all the vertue and power come from the deity to gather and perfect the Saints, forgive sinnes, raise the dead, judge the world; and by his deity only he is present with us now, yet as man also he is head of his Church and not as God only; for had he been only God, he could not have been a suitable head or second Adam, but that he became by becoming man, and taking our nature upon him. *The seed of the woman must break the Serpents head*. The governing power and wisdom of a King is in his invisible soul, yet he is a visible King. It is true also that Christ came not in the daies of his flesh as a visible, temporal Monarch, in *Dauids* civil throne, yet Christ confesseth then unto *Pilate* that he was a king, though his kingdom was not of this world, i. e. civil, to oppose *Cæsars*, yet it is in this world, and external in this world also. God over-ruled *Pilate* to set a true title over Christ on the Crosse. *Jesus of Nazareth king of the Jews*. As a King he had all power in heaven and earth given him, Mat. 28. 10, 19. and immediatly thereupon as a King he issues out his Commission to his Apostles, *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, &c.* It is not because Christ died for all as a Priest, that this commission is so general, but because all power in heaven and earth was given to him, therefore as a King he summons in all, even the very rebels to yield obedience to his lawful authority, but only such as

yield

yield obedience and come in are saved by him. He set Officers Sect. 6. and offices, and gave commandment to his Apostles, *Act. 1.2.* And appointed the form of Ecclesiastical proceedings in discipline, in case of scandal, *Mat. 18.* And this is no other doctrine then our *reverend Assembly* hath set out, both in their larger and shorter *Catechism*. That Christ our redeemer executeth the offices of a Prophet, a Priest, and a King, both in his estate of humiliation and exaltation. Neither can I see any reason why Christ should be denied to execute his kingly office while he was here below, any more then his Priestly or Prophetical. If he was then a King and had all power given him, he did not suspend the execution of it, while he was on earth, *Joh. 5. 17.* neither doth *Beza in conf. fid. ch. 5. art. 5.* cited by *M. Hooker*, deny Christ to be head as man, though he acknowledge him to be head as God also. And though he saith, that *he communicates that degree of dignity to none else*: He by those words excludeth the Pope, &c. but not Christs own humane nature; by which it is indeed that we come to our union with God.

All that can truly be alledged in this case is, that Christ is not now visibly seen as King with our bodily eyes, nor can we come to him bodily, nor receive any verbal commands from his mouth, as we may from an earthly King. But how few subjects have that priviledge in regard of their earthly Sovereigns! The legal commands are counted the Kings commands, and not his verbal only, nor chiefly. Yet we finde that Christ after his ascension did in *Rev. 2. and 3. Chapt.* write a letter by *John* unto the 7. Churches of *Asia*, and reproves or commends and exhorts them particularly: and in the inditing of it appears as a man to *John*: and useth arguments therein from things betiding him as man: as that he was dead and is alive again, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, &c.

Object. Though there be a Church-Catholike, yet it is not visible, because it is the object of our faith, it being an *Article* of our faith, *I beleeve the holy Church-Catholike.* Now faith is the evidence of things not seen, *Heb. 11. 1.* Things seen are the object of sense and knowledge, not of faith. For what a man seeth, how can he be said to believe? faith and sense

Chap. 5.

are opposed each to other by the Apostle.

Ans^r. If indeed we take the Catholike Church in the largest sense, for the elect past, present, and to come, as some do; the Church-Catholike is invisible. Also the grace of such as are invisible members, is invisible: but that is not the Church we are speaking of: The Church we have in hand is the whole company of visible believers in the world, considered as visible.

Secondly I answer, it is not true that that which is in it self visible cannot be the object of faith. Indeed that which is actually seen is the object of that mans sense and knowledge that seeth it: but that which is visible, *i. e.* which may be seen, may be the object of faith to him that seeth it not actually. I believe there is *Orbis universus* a whole world, but I never saw it, and yet it is visible. I believe that there is a kingdom of *Spain*, and Empire of *Germany*, and they are visible, but I never saw them, nor am ever likely to see them. I believe there are constellations about the South-pole, but I never saw them, and yet they are as visible as those about the North pole: So I believe that the Church visible is now no longer included in the land of *Canaan*, but is spread over many kingdoms, and may be into all, but I never saw it in the extent thereof, and yet it is visible in it self. The extent of place though it lessens the visibility, yet it takes it not away. I know this was an argument of an eminent Divine of ours against a Jesuite, and it holds strongly against the visibility of the Church-Catholike taken in the first sense, but not in our sense. Yea, grant the Church-Catholike to be a *Genus*, yet the argument reacheth it not, for a *Genus* is not the object of faith, but of knowledge, because the assurance thereof ariseth not from the credit of any ones word, but from our own understanding.

CHAP. VI.

That the Church-Catholike visible is an Organical, yet similar body. Yea, one Organical body.

THAT the particular Churches are or ought to be organized, *SECT. I.*
It is not a thing questioned by M. Ellis or M. Hooker, nor any one that I know of. And therefore I shall neither trouble my self nor my reader about that. It may not only be drawn from *Mat. 18. Tell the Church*, which cannot be referred only or chiefly to the Church-Catholike, for that even in a general Council ministerially is seldom convened, and cannot be informed by every one that it scandalized, But also from *Tit. 1. 5. I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest ordain Elders in every city.* And *Heb. 13. 6, 17, 24.* Remember, obey, and salute them that have the rule over you. Of the Elders of *Ephesus* we read, *Act. 20. 17.* And of the Angels of the seven Churches of *Asia*, *Rev. 2. and 3. Chapt.* And yet many of these were combined Churches of many Congregations, and might be so all for ought I know. And we read of the Elders of the Church of *Jerusalem* in the *Acts*, but whether fixed to particular Congregations or no I know not, to be sure they ruled in common. Only we finde *Rom. 16. 1.* Of *Phoebe* a servant of the Church at *Cenchrae*, which is the most probable example of a Congregational Church, as I said before, but not certainly. But I shall take that for granted that particular Churches ought to be organized.

But with what Officers? whether with a Pastor and a Teacher, or with preaching and meer ruling-Elders? Or by whom these ought to be elected or ordained, or how maintained? Or whether their power be from Christ immediatly, or from the Congregation, the Officers being as their stewards and servants? Or whether the Congregation hath votes and suffrages in the dispensing of censures, and the Elders but their mouth to pronounce and execute their censures, as he that sits for judge and gives the charge at a Sessions, or a chair-man at a Committee is, in regard of the rest of the Justices or whole Committee to propound, gather their votes, and passe sentence accordingly?

Chap. 6.

Sect. 2.

It is similar.

cordingly? whether their work in such Ecclesiastical meetings be only to convene and dissolve, and to bring things into order for the hearing of the rest? are different questions, which are not to my purpose, and therefore I will not meddle with them.

Now seeing every part is or ought to be organized, the whole may be said to be Organical in that sense. If all the *species* be organized (supposing they were *species*) the *genus* in a logical consideration must be said to be organized, because it is the common nature of the *species* so to be. Much more if we consider the several Congregations as members, as indeed they are.

Now because I said that these particular Congregations thus organized, are similar, integral parts of the whole, M. Ellis chargeth me with a contradiction to mine own end and scope, and disagreeing with *Apollonius*, vind. 54.

First, he thinketh he hath caught me upon the hip of such a contradiction against my self and scope, and that I can come off no otherwise then with a *Veniam q. damus, petimusq. vicissim*, nor any otherwise be relieved but by the charitable benevolence of my readers ingenuity. But if there had been such a palpable contradiction, it is a marvel that reverend, judicious M. Hooker should not finde it, and shew it as well as he. If all the countries in the world had the same kinde of civil government, both officers and laws respectively, though not dependent, were it a contradiction to say they were similar integral parts of the world? And if all the Corporations in a Kingdom (though organical bodies) were of the same constitution, and had the same Officers, as Maiors, &c. would they not be similar integral parts of the kingdom? yea, even in physical mixed bodies, as medicinal potions compounded of several ingredients, yet because the mixture is alike in all parts they may be said to be similar parts of the whole. *Materialia componentia sunt dissimilata, partes integrales compositi & constituti sunt similes*. So the Church-Catholike in regard of the constituent materials, or essential parts, viz. Officers and private Christians, is dissimilar, but in regard of the several Congregations constituted, which are integral parts of the whole, it is similar because they are similar. I did not mean by similar *quarto modo simile* (as I may say) in the strictest sense, as haply the pure element of fire is, but such a sim-

military

milarity as is consistent with a mixture of ingredient materials. Sect. 2.
Every Congregation in reference to other Congregation is similar, being of a like constitution, but in reference to it self it is dissimilar, consisting of Officers and private Christians.

This assertion need not seem so harsh, seeing D. Ames as I shewed before asserteth the same. And M. Barlet in his model, p. 45. confesseth the particular Churches to be similar parts of the Church-Catholike: and saith the Independents have left it upon record that they are so, and for that cites, *Ames. medul.* c. 32. And M. William Sedgewick in his Sermon before divers of the Parliament, pag. 4. And chargeth the London-Ministers for an untruth in affirming (in the preface of *7m divinum*) that they deny it. But the charge is unjust; they only set down the difference between the Presbyterians and Independents there to be in this, that the Presbyterians hold that there is one general Church of Christ on earth, and that all particular Churches and single Congregations are but as similar parts of the whole: and the Independents (say they) hold that there is no other visible Church of Christ, but only a single Congregation, meeting in one place to partake of all Ordinances. The London-Ministers affirm only that the Independents deny one general Church of Christ on earth, not the similarity of particular Congregations. But it will necessarily follow that they deny them to be similar parts, if they deny the whole to which the parts must relate. And if they make the whole Church a *genus* (as they do) then must they make the particular Churches *similar species*, which is little lesse then a contradiction, for the formality of a *species* lieth in dissimilarity and difference from the opposite *species*.

Now to shew that this assertion of the similarity of particular Churches crosseth mine own scope, M. Ellis sets down mine opinion, with a mark as if the words were mine own, which neither are my words nor my sense, viz. *That the Church (visible Catholike) is an Organical, ministerial, governing body, i.e. (saith "he) not such a body as is the element of water and air, every "part whereof is of the same nature, vertue and power in it self "considered, but such a body as a man hath, which is distinguish- "ed by several members, &c. And such a body as all Corpora-*

Chap. 6.

"tions are. Now this (saith he) contradicts plainly the former both opinion and expression; for if the Church-Catholike be a similar body, and all Congregations alike, and the whole nothing differing in nature or constitution from the parts, then the Catholike visible Church is no more the governing Church then a particular.

Ans. To let passe his unfair dealing with my self (and others) in misreciting my words.

I said indeed the Church-Catholike was an *Organical* body, but not a ministerial governing body. For the scope of my Thesis was and is to prove the Church-Catholike as it consists of Officers and private Christians, to be the prime Church to which the Ordinances are given respectively, as the Officers or private members are capable; and to particular Churches secondarily. I spake not of the Organs or Governours only. The body of Officers is indeed a governing body, called a ministerial Church, but the whole Church either particular or general, is no governing body, no more then a whole Corporation or kingdom can be said to be a governing body, but they are governed bodies, and so is the Church both particular and general.

Indeed I finde the words ministerial governing Church in *M. Rutherford in his due rights of Presbys.* 177, 178, 179, &c. but it is clear that he takes it not in *M. Ellis's* sence, but for a Church furnished with Officers, and having discipline and government exercised in it; for he was farre from making the body of the Church to be the receptacle of the keys, and having power of governing. He saith the keys were given for the Church, but not to the Church.

It is only a Scottish expression not to be so expounded and strained, as *M. Ellis* doth, who bendeth his whole reply against a sence of it, which I beleve was not *M. Rutherford's* meaning.

Neither did I make the whole to differ any thing in nature, constitution or power from the parts; but said they have the same kinde of intensive power, but in the Church-Catholike it is of larger extension. Similar bodies conjoynd exert their power more intensely and extensively, then when single. All the water of the Sea will cool and moisten more and further then one drop; a great fire will warm, yea, burn more and further then

then a spark: a great heap of stones extends further and will weigh more than a little one. So all Churches (if they could meet) have no other power when met together, than a single Church, but being combined, the power both reacheth further in extension of places, and it more august and solemn, and to be the rather respected and submitted unto. Sect. 3.

But this (he saith) crosseth *Apollonius*, whom (saith he) I follow, but indeed I never saw his book, nor heard of it, until a good while after I had composed my Thesis, and then inserted I think but 2. or 3. sentences of his. "*Apollonius* (saith he) saith "that *Eph. 4. 16.* is meant of an organical, ministerial body, differing in members, which *M. Hudson* expounds to be meant of "a similar body whose parts are all alike.

Ans. They are alike in the integrals, as I said before, but not in the essentials. But where doth *Apollonius* deny the particular Congregations to be similar integrals parts of the Catholike? There is therefore no disagreement among the Presbyterians in this point (as *M. Ellis* suggesteth, *vin. 54.*) that one of them would have one thing, another another.

But the main question comes now to be discussed, *viz. Whether the whole Church-Catholike visible be one Organical body?* which if it can be made appear, will end the whole controversy. Sect. 3. It is one Organical body.

The Church is distinguished into *Entitive* and *Organical*.

The Church visible is called *Entitive*, not because of the inward grace which is essential to an invisible member, but from the reception and embracing the Christian Catholike faith, which is essential to a visible beleever. And it is called *Organical*, in reference to the Officers thereof, which are the Organs of the Church, or in regard of the Offices which Christ hath instituted to be in his visible Church. This distinction halteth as much as that of the Church-visible and invisible: for the *Organical* Church is also *Entitive*, *viz.* it is of such as have received and embraced the Christian faith, and is made up of such, and only of such: yet there is a difference in notion, but not in persons. Indeed in some sense a company of visible beleevers may be said to be a Church-Entitive, and not *Organical*, because they are not actually under any particular Officers: as a company

Chap. 6.

of visible Christians in *New England* inhabiting together to make a Congregation, but as yet have chosen no Officers; may in reference to other organized Congregations be said to be inorganical, and entitive only: but this sense is not the most proper sense of the word. For if they be, then but a Church-entitive, then also after they have Officers, if those particular Officers die, they should return to be a Church-Entitive only again, in the *interim* before they have chosen any new ones.

Now though in consideration we may distinguish between the essence of beleevers, as beleevers embracing the Christian faith, and their existence under Officers, especially under particular Officers: yet the existence of visible beleevers, members of the Church-Catholike, can hardly be without reference to Officers. For the ministry of the Officers is the usual means of their conversion: and to be sure they cannot be admitted to be actual members of the Church-Catholike by baptism, but by some of the Officers, though not considered as their particular Officers, yet Officers in general. And such persons as receive the doctrine of Christ which denominates them to be beleevers, are bound to receive his commands also, to submit themselves to his Ministers for their edification. And though they have no particular Officers, yet as they look upon the Church as a society of men and fellow-members to whom they joyn themselves in the general, though not as yet in any particular membership: so they look upon the Ministers as Christs Ministers, to whom they are to be subject in the Lord, to receive their doctrine, exhortations and reproofs, and from whom also, if they prove scandalous, heretical, infectious, or apostates, they must expect disciplinary censures, though they be no particular members, under a particular Minister.

There is a question whether the Church or the Ministers be first, because the Ministers are the instrumental cause of the conversion of the Church, and the Church of the choice of the Ministers, which is something like that Philosophical question, Whether the hen or the egge were first, for as the egge comes of a hen, so the hen comes of an egge. And as that is resolved by the consideration of the creation, and then God made the

then first: so is this question by consideration of the first institution and setting up of the Evangelical Catholike Church; and then we finde that Christ set up the Officers first to convert men to be beleivers, and they being converted to the faith of Christ are bound to submit themselves to Christs Ministers in the Lord. And because they will stand in need of constant inspection, teaching and ruling, which they cannot enjoy from Ministers in general, as so considered: because they are dispersed into several places for habitation, and take particular parts of Christs Church to watch over; therefore they are to desire and endeavour to have some of Christs Ministers to take the particular inspection of them. But we know that at first they receive Baptism not from their own particular Minister, or not as so considered; for being newly converted into the Church, and not baptized, they cannot as I conceive be members of a particular Congregation, until after baptism, but they receive it as from one of Christs Ministers in general, and are by him admitted into the visible body the Church, and after this have liberty to choose under the inspection of what Ministers they will put themselves. See more of this *Qu. 2. S. 2. 4.*

Now before the proof of this assertion, it will be needful to explain a little what I mean by one Organical body; I doe not mean that there is one universal, visible, actual society, consisting of all such as are accounted or to be esteemed Christians, subject d actually to one or many universal, general, actual Pastors or guides, from whom subordinates must derive their office and power, and with whom they must communicate in some general sacred things, which may make them one Church as the Jews were. And which general sacred services or duties can be performed by that universal head or heads, and that Church only.

Such an universal Christian Church Christ never ordained, no; not in the daies of the Apostles, to whom the extraordinary care of all the Churches was committed. Nor that all the whole Church should be subjected to one supream Tribunal of Officers constantly erected, and continued among them. Nor yet to communicate with Christ himself (though in some sense he may be said to be a visible head) in some worship to be per-

Chap. 6.

formed by all joyntly assembled at some especial solemnity, as the Jews at the Passeeover.

But an habitual, Politico-Ecclesiastical society, body, flock, in one sheepfold of the militant Church, in uniform subjection to the same Lord, the same Laws, in the same faith, and under the same visible seal of Baptism, performing the same worship and service in kinde: and though the members be dispersed far and wide, yea, divided into several particular places, and secondary combinations of vicinities, for actual, constant enjoyment of Ordinances (as particular Corporations in a Kingdom, which is an accidental, not essential relation to them as subjects of the Kingdom) yet still those Ordinances, admissions, ejections, have influence into the whole body, as it is a polity: and the members indefinitely may of right communicate one with another in any place, or any company of Christians, though every person so meeting but occasionally, may be of a several particular Church, and the Minister dispensing, a particular Pastor to none of them all, yea, though none of them all be fixed members of any particular Congregation, nor the Minister dispensing fixed to no particular Congregation neither: by vertue of their genetal membership in the visible body and kingdom of Christ, and of the habitual indefinitenesse of the Ministers office, and the common donation of the Ordinances by Christ to his whole visible Kingdom, and to all the subjects and members thereof, which have a common freedom therein. And in this sense the word Church is taken in Scripture. *His bodies sake which is the Church, whereof I Paul am made a Minister. The house of God which is the Church.* Now because there is no such civil society or kingdom that will in every thing parallel this: but there use to be some general offices and officers, and some inferiour subordinate, receiving power and authority by descention, derivation, or subordination, and the inferiour Officers of lesse extent of place and power then the superiour. As the Lord chief Justice of *England* is above inferiour Justices, and his warrant can reach all persons in all the Counties of the Kingdom, and there be constant Courts of Kings bench and Common Pleas for judicature for all the Subjects of the whole Kingdom (though haply it was not so in the four Monarchies)

this makes men stumble at the name and notion of a Church- Catholike visible. But as in other things Christs Kingdom is neither of this world, nor like unto worldly politics, so neither in this. But every Minister of the Church in his particular place serveth the Church-Catholike visible in admitting members to general freedom in it, and ejecting out from general communion, prayeth publikely for the whole body, and manageth his particular charge, in reference to, and so as may stand with the good of the whole body, whereof his Congregation is but a member. And the Ordinances therein administered, are the Ordinances given to the whole, not as to a *genus*, which is but a notion, and can have no Ordinances, but as to a spiritual kinde of an habitual organical body and polity; as to a sort of men so and so qualified, bound up in an union and unity of the same head, laws, seals, worship and communion.

Now the same arguments which prove the Church-Catholike an Integral, will serve to prove it one organical body also, and therefore I shall take some of them into consideration again, under this head and in this notion.

1. It will appear by the names and metaphors whereby the Church-Catholike is called and set out in Scripture, which are taken from things which are not only each of them an Integral, but each of them one Organical body: and in *ea formalis ratione* lyeth the analogy between them and the Church.

It is compared unto a natural body, which is an organical integral having many members and Organs, which though they lie indeed in the severall members, yet are Organs of the whole, and the severall members members of the whole, and doe their severall actions, and perform their severall offices for the good of the whole, and sympathize together, 1 Cor. 12. 12. *For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many, are one body: so also is Christ.*

This is not meant of the Church of Corinth only, but of the Catholike Church, because it is the whole body to which Christ is the head, and Christs person as the head of the whole, and this whole body is called Christ, *i. e.* mystically,

Chap. 6. the whole receiving denomination from the better part, the head.

And so M. *Bartley* takes it in his *Model*, pag. 35. for the whole Church. And so all Expositors that I have met with, except some few of late, who to avoid the dirt of this argument would have it meant of the Church of *Corinth*, as a particular Church. But it will sound very harsh to make Christ and the Church of *Corinth* to be called Christ, when they are but the head, and a part of Christs body. It is the body whereof *Paul* was a member, *v. 13. We are all baptized*, where *Paul* puts in himself and all believers.

Object. But this is meant of the invisible company of believers.

Ans. It is true, but it is spoken of them as visible, because it is brought in there to shew the diversities of gifts, offices, operations and administrations in the visible Church: there is an eye and an ear, &c. mentioned, and the Officers of the Church named; now there are no Officers of the invisible Church as invisible, nor different administrations; as they are members of the invisible body they are all similar, and have the same standing and operations of their general calling as Christians, not as Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, &c. And many that have these common gifts of the holy Ghost (which are by the Spirit of Christ) and the Offices there mentioned, were not invisible members of Christ, yet were not only members, but Officers in this body there spoken of. It is also the visible body there meant, because the 2. external seals, *viz. Baptism* and the *Lords Supper* are specified in *v. 13.* as means and signs of this union in one body, and they are visibly administered.

There is an invisible body of Christ and a visible, the invisible is inorganical, the visible organical; the invisible while they are in the visible Church are visible members thereof, and so put on the relation of Officer and private member. It is true, some things are spoken of the whole in reference to the better part, the invisible number; and as they all professed themselves to be of the invisible body, so the Apostle speaks of them, and to them, as if they were, as they ought to be, and at least made a shew as if they were. But that the place is meant of an organical

cal body as one, is out of question, and that the analogy between the Church and such a body, lay in the unity and organicalness, is as clear. Sect. 4.

The like is spoken *Rom. 12. 4, 5.* For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office; so we being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another. It is the Church-Catholike, not Roman particular Church; Paul puts in himself, yet had never been at Rome then. It is organical, for the Officers are there enumerated. It is one, for there is a sympathy of members spoken of. To this purpose is that of *Salmas. Retinebitur nexus communicativa, & sympathia inter omnia membra Dominici corporis, i.e. Ecclesia, qua nisi una sit non potest esse viva, Appar. p. 281.*

Also it is set out by a political body. Sometimes it is called a kingdom, and the kingdom of heaven, as I shewed before out of many places of Scripture. Now a Kingdom is one Organical body; for so many men living together within the same limits make not a Kingdom, but as it is combined by the same Laws, under one Governour or Government. In the *Heptarchy*, this one Kingdom since, under one King and body of laws, were seven Kingdoms. Now if the Church-Catholike bears such an analogy to one Kingdom as to be called a Kingdom, it is from this that it is one organized Integral.

It is also called a city, and sometimes *Jerusalem*, and as it is reformed it is called *new Jerusalem*, and the members both of *Jews* and *Gentiles* are called fellow-citizens, *Eph. 2. 19.* Now a City is one Organical body under one common government: otherwise so many houses or streets and inhabitants being together, would not make them a City. Sometimes the buildings and inhabitants, which if under one government would make one city and Corporation, being great and near, and haply contiguous, yet wanting a charter to make them a Corporation are none; yea, by difference of Charter, Government and chief Governours are two Cities as *London* and *Westminster*. The Church-Catholike therefore being one city is one organical body.

Also it is set out sometimes by one martial or military body,

Chap. 6.

body, and is called an *Army terrible with banners*, Cant. 6. 10. which by some is interpreted Church-censures. M. Cotton indeed expounds it of the Church of the Jews, when they shall be called home by conversion to the Christian faith; to be sure it is the Church-militant. Now an Army is one organical body under one General, and the same Laws martial, though quartered in divers places: therefore so is the Church-Catholike.

It is also set out by an *Oeconomical body*, a family or household, Eph. 2. 19. Now a family is one Organical body, wherein are Governours or a Governour, and governed, an husband, father, or master; and therefore so is the Church-Catholike, else the analogy should not hold. All these metaphors and many more, whereby the Church-Catholike is set out, shew it one visible, organical body.

Secondly, That the Church-Catholike visible is one society virtually and habitually, appears, because by Baptism wherever administred, the baptized visible believer is admitted a member not of the particular Church among whom he was baptized, nor to bear any special relation to the Minister baptizing him, that he must take a special inspection over him as one of his particular flock and charge, but into the whole general body of Christs kingdom visible. For, as I shewed before, there was Baptism administred as the seal of the general covenant, before particular Congregations were set up. See more of this, 2. 2. S. 2. and S. 8.

And also because by excommunication a person is not cast out of that Congregation only where the censure was past, but out of general communion with all other Churches in the world, even the whole visible body of Christ. Certificates indeed we finde in Scripture to others, of their excommunication, that so others might avoid communion with them. As of the excommunication of *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, 1 Tim. 1. 20. And so we reade also of certificates of Apostates, who it is like were excommunicated. As of *Phigellus* and *Hermogenes*, 2 Tim. 1. 15. And of *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, 2 Tim. 2. 17. The former of which was excommunicated, and it is probable the latter also, by the same reason. The like certificate we finde again of *Alexander*, 2 Tim. 4. 14, 15. But no new act of excommunication past

past upon them any where else.

Alexander Bishop of Alexandria having excommunicated Eusebius Bishop of Nicomedia an Arian, writes an Epistle to certify it to all other Ministers. *Charissimis honoratissimisque fratribus, qui ubique gentium sunt nobiscum in Ecclesia ministerio conjuncti* αὐδερπύροισ τῆς ἀνταρχῆς ἐκκλησίας. Cum in sacris literis sit unum corpus Ecclesie Catholica nobis traditum. &c. therefore he signifyeth by letters what he had done, *ἵνα εἴτε πᾶσι χριστιανῶν ἐν μὲν ὁ ἑκκλησίᾳ χριστιανῶν ὡς ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀλλήλοις*, Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 3. Nine Bishops excommunicated Jovin and Maximus, and that excommunication by Cyprian and others was approved as valid. The like we finde of Novatus excommunicated at Rome by Cornelius and a Councel there, and it was certified to Fabius Bishop of Antioch, and approved by him, and by Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria to whom the Epistles came. Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 35. And Samosatenus excommunicated at Antioch, was so accounted of the whole world, Nicoph. 6. 28. The Novatians excommunicated in Affrick are so held at Rome. Cyp. l. 1. Ep. 3. and 13.

Thirdly, It appears to be one organical body by the identity of the external Covenant, charter, promises, and laws of the whole Church. The Covenant, charter, and promises, are but one grant, not one Covenant in kinde and many *species* thereof, but one individual Covenant of grace granted to the whole Church. This is not the Covenant whereby particular Congregations are said to be constituted, but the whole body. The Churches constituted by particular Covenants are alterable, divisible, extinguishible (as M. Norton confesseth, p. 30.) which this is not: they are many and particular Covenants, this one and general: they are accidental, humane, arbitrary, and super-added; this essential, divine, necessary, and prime. And though this Covenant may seem but to belong to the Church as Entitive, yet the Laws which are also one visible systeme, argue it to be organical, because they relate to Officers and discipline: and they binde all not only *vi materia*, but as proceeding from the same fountain and authour, the King of the whole Church, not *quā* particular members, but *quā* members of the whole.

Fourthly, It appears by the general right of communion,

Chap. 6.

that all the members have habitually and indefinitely to joyn in, as providence offereth opportunity, though not cast into a Congregational combination, as all cannot be. Any visible hearer under the seal of Baptism only, hath an inherent right to worship with any other visible Christians in confession, petition, thanksgiving, and praise; and to prophecy with them in the Apostles sense, i. e. joyn with them in partaking of that Ordinance, to sing with them, and receive the Lords Supper with them, and to be entreated by any Minister as an Ambassadour of Christ to be reconciled, 2 Cor. 5. 20. and is bound to submit to the doctrinal admonitions and reproofs of any Minister according to the word: and the reason why any Minister may not passe a judicial censure also, if there be cause (seeing the keys are commendable) is not because he wants habitual power in discipline, as well as doctrine, but because that is to be performed in a Court of Elders, and a strange Minister wants a call to joyn with any such Court, to bring his habitual power into act: yet our brethren will non-communication or deny communion with a stranger, if they have any thing against him, which is virtually a suspension of him; yea, if they have not positive assurance by testimony (not of his being in the general Covenant, for that is requisite, but) of his being a fixed member of some other Congregation which they approve of, not only for having the essentials of a Church, but as a pure Church: for upon that ground they deny the communion to some members of our Churches that go over with certificates (though not to members of their own Churches) because they judge us as impure. Indeed certificates are requisite from strangers to notify their general right by being in the general Covenant, and to notify their personal innocency from error or scandal which might debar them.

But they only declare a right, they give none: neither doth their right proceed from the membership of the particular Congregation, from whence they come, but from the general, which is implied in their particular membership, because Congregations consist only of such; and they are witnesses of his godly conversation, he having lived with them.

As for judicial, Ecclesiastical censures, I confesse it is most orderly

derly to turn the accused person, and his accusations to his own Congregation, where an Eldership hath taken the particular inspection of him, and have power in *actu secundo* already called forth to deal with him: but suppose they will not, or neglect it, or he will not return, but abide still in another place; or suppose he be not a fixed member in any Congregation, but a wandering star, and yet is a baptized person, and is very scandalous or very erroneous, and fit to infect the persons among whom he converseth; shall there be no remedy for that Congregation? For ought I know, they may put their general, habitual power into act, and upon sufficient witness proceed against him, and finding him obstinate may excommunicate him, as well as a civil Officer will keep the kings peace in his own Town, by clapping an unruly, riotous, or traiterous stranger by the heels, if he take him within his limits.

Fifthly, I might argue also from the opposition of the adversaries of the Church, both Satan and persecutors, who oppose it not essentially only, but politically; their spite being against the Officers and Organs of the Church, not only *quia* Christians, but *quia* Ministers, not *quia* Ministers of this or that particular Congregation, but *quia* the Ministers of the Church, and not only as dispensers of Word and Sacraments, but as dispensers of censures especially, for they do most usually gaul men, and move their anger. They look upon the Church as one body, and upon Ministers as Officers of the Church in a general consideration, and so may we.

Sixthly, It appears by the indefiniteness of the office of Ministers: which I reserved for the last, because I shall dilate a little more upon it then the former, And indeed upon this hinge hangeth the whole question of the Organical integrality of the Church Catholike visible. And turn the question which way you will, it will rest on this center, *viz.* Whether a Minister be a Minister to any but his own Congregation? Sect. 5.

I finde M. *Ellis* affirming that a Minister is an Officer only to his own Congregation, *vind.* p. 8. And the answer of the Elders of several Churches in New-England unto 9. Positions, p. 8. Their words are these, "If you mean by Ministerial act, such an act of authority and power in dispensing of Gods Ordinances as a
" Minister

Chap. 6.

" Minister doth perform to the Church, whereunto he is called
 " to be a Minister, then we deny that he can so perform any
 " Ministerial act to any other Church but his own, because his of-
 " fice extends no further then his call.

So M. Best in his *Church-Plea* p. 30 saith, Officers of Churches may be helpful to other Churches as Christians, but not as Ministers. To the same purpose M. Bartlet in his *model*, p. 69. Hereby it appears they suppose the Ordination of a Minister to his office, is limited to the particular Congregation that call him. Indeed the call of the people exerts or calls forth the exercise of his office unto them in particular constantly; but his Ordination to his office is more general, and giveth him habitual power *in actu primo*, to exercise and perform the acts belonging to his office elsewhere upon a call. Christ giveth the office, and hath annexed power of dispensing his Ordinances: the Presbytery ministerially admit this or that man into it, not as a Presbytery of that particular Congregation, for they may none of them belong unto it, but as a Presbytery of Christs Ministers having a call to give that Ordination in a regular way: and the particular Congregation, by desire and election give a call to the exercise of this power among them, *pro his & nunc*.

" *Habitu & potestate omnes Episcopi sunt Episcopi cujusvis in*
 " *orbe vel paracia, vel provincia, quia in quavis apti sunt, habiles,*
 " *& idonei exercere Episcopalia sua munera, quando illuc legitime*
 " *vocantur, ac mittuntur. Actum vero & quoad legitimum exerciti-*
 " *um, ibi solummodo Episcopi sunt ubi per missionem & vocationem*
 " *illam mediatam Dei, &c. huic illive Paracia, &c. presciantur.*
 Crakenthorp. Def. Eccl. Ang. c. 28.

Now that a Minister is a Minister and so habitually in office to more then his own Congregation, and therefore indefinitely to all the whole Church, will appear by these proofs. First, because the donation of the keys, and the institution and commission of the Evangelical Ministry was in reference to the whole. *Go teach all Nations, and baptize them*. Whenas yet there was no distinction of Congregations. *God set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers*, 1 Cor. 12. 28. So Eph. 4. 13.

As God gave the Levites to the whole house of Israel, and

they did at first in the wilderness serve all the Tribes *conjunctim*. Sect. 5.
sim, as one body of Officers over one combined large Congregation, but afterwards when the Tribes were dispersed in *Canaan*, the Levites were dispersed among all the Tribes, and exercised their office of teaching and judging in the several places where they dwelt; yet this divested them not of their general habitual power, this made not their office to stand in relation to the particular city or Synagogue where they did constantly exercise: and when they removed from place to place, as the wandering Levite, *Num.* 17.8. did, they still retained their habitual office and power, and needed no new consecration, but by vertue of their office did exercise the acts belonging to it where they had their particular station and call.

So is it with the Evangelical Ministry of the New Testament: a Minister of the Gospel bears a double relation, one to the Church-Catholike indefinitely, another to that particular Congregation over which he is set for the constant exercise of his office. And if he removes to another place, he needs no new Ordination; for that continueth and abideth still upon him; it being to the essence of his office, and not in reference either to the place from whence he cometh, or to which he goeth only. A Physician or Lawyer needeth no new license, or call to the Bar, though they remove to other places, and have other patients and clients. The Justice of peace who is in commission for the whole County, though he exercised it in one part of the County, while he lived there, yet if he removes to the other end of the County, he needeth no new commission to execute his office there, where he never did before, because it was habitual to the whole County, though actually exercised where he lived; so though a Minister removes, he needeth no new Ordination, but a new call to the exercise of his office there, no more then a private Christian by removing into another Congregation, needeth a new Baptism, because neither Ordination nor Baptism stand in relation to the particular Congregation, but the Church-Catholike. As he that is admitted a freeman in any Hall of any Company in *London*, is admitted a freeman of the whole City, as well as of that Company: and he that by reason of his birth hath right to be baptized in any

T

Congregation,

Chap. 6. Congregation, is admitted a member of the whole society of the Church-Catholike visible, as well as of that Congregation: so he that is ordained a Minister, as by the occasion of the call of a particular Congregation he is ordained their particular Minister, so also is he ordained a Minister of Christ and the Gospel, and Church in general. "Ordination (saith M. *Ruther.* *1st*) maketh a man a Pastor under Christ formally and essentially, the peoples consent and choice do not make him a Minister, but their Minister, the Minister of such a Church: he is indefinitely made a Pastor for the Church. *Ruth. peaceab. plon. 263.*

And to the same purpose it is that M. *Ball* saith. "A Minister chosen and set over one society, is to look unto that people committed to his charge, &c. but he is a Minister in the Church universal: for as the Church is one, so is the Ministry one, of which every Minister (sound and Orthodox) doth hold his part. And though he is a Minister over that flock which he is to attend, yet he is a Minister in the Church-universal. The function or power of exercising that function in the abstract, must be distinguished from the power of exercising it concretely, according to the divers circumstances of places. The first belongeth to a Minister every where in the Church, the latter is proper to the place and people where he doth minister. The lawful use of the power is limited to that Congregation ordinarily; the power it self is not so bounded. In ordination Presbyters are not restrained to one or other certain place, as if they were to be deemed Ministers there only, though they be set over a certain people. And as the faithful in respect of their community between them, must and ought to perform the offices of love one to another, though of different societies; so the Ministers in respect of their communion, must and ought upon occasion to perform Ministerial offices toward the faithful of distinct societies. *Trial of new Church. way. p. 33.*

To the same purpose is that of *Crackenhorp*. "Episcopi omnes quia Episcopi universali Ecclesia pastores sunt, & iure Divino sic pastores sunt. Episcopus item unusquisque particularis sua Ecclesia pastor est, non quia Episcopus sed quia Romanus,

"Romanus, aut Alexandrinus Episcopus, nec jure Dicitur Sect. 6.
 "sed humano solum, & Ecclesiastico, pastor sic est. Cura om-
 "nium omnium, quæ Episcopi sunt, ad omnes spectat, fidei Sal-
 "utem."

"Præter peculiarem curam quam singuli habent pastores sua-
 "rum Ecclesiarum, generalem etiam quandam curam habere videmus
 "sunt universalis Ecclesia in his rebus quæ ad salutem & bonum
 "omnium Ecclesiarum cedunt, Appar. 170. For, saith he, as in
 the natural body, the particular members have a double of-
 fice, one general and common for the defence and service of
 the whole body, and another special and proper; *speciale ac
 proprium*; so it is in the Church. It was the commendation
 of Asbanasius by Basil in Ep. 72. *Tantam gerit omnium Ecclesi-
 arum curam, quantam ejus quæ sibi peculiariter a Domino tradi-
 ta est.*

Secondly, It appears by the subj. & matter whereabout the
 office of the Ministry is exercised, viz, the Ordinances of God,
 the Word and Sacraments, and Prayer: the good news of the
 Gospel, the profers, promises and precepts, which equally per-
 tain to all parts of the Church-Catholike. Therefore their fun-
 ction is set out indefinitely, in reference unto the subject matter
 of it, and not the people to whom they dispense them. A Mi-
 nister is an Ambassadors of Jesus Christ, and is in office habi-
 tually to the whole Church: and though he be set to his seiger
 in a particular Church, yet the subject of his office reacheth to
 the whole Church, and not that place only; yea, to all that are
 capable of reconciliation, for the Ministry is the Ministry of
 reconciliation; and even when he delivereth his Embassage in
 his own Church, he is to deliver both profers, promises and pre-
 cepts indefinitely to strangers of other Congregations, yea, of
 forreign nations, if they come into his Congregation. Suppose
 a Mayor of a Corporation should send abroad his Serjeants to
 summon the whole Corporation to a general Court, and for
 expediency should send one into one street, another into ano-
 ther, a third into a third street: if any of these serjeants in their
 walks should meet a freeman that dwelleth in another street,
 ought he to forbear to summon him, because he dwells not in his
 particular walk, seeing he is an indefinite Officer to the whole

Sect. 6.

Chap. 6.

Corporation, or is that summons without authority, because the man dwells out of his particular limits, seeing the businesse concerns all? Surely no, he ought to exert his general, habitual power of his office, and summon him. So seeing Gods message is general to all, though the Ministers (who are indefinite Officers) be settled in particular Congregations for expediency, yet they have power by vertue of their office to deliver it to any Christian that God offers them an opportunity to preach unto. It is unreasonable, that seeing the message is indefinite, and concerns all in general, the commission to deliver it should be but particular. But I shall touch upon this in the second question.

Thirdly, It appears by the end of the Ministerial function, viz. to increase and edifie the body of Christ, not only the invisible body but the visible also, by converting such as do not as yet beleve the Gospel. And this was a great part of the work of the Ministers in the primitive times: but how could they baptize those they had converted, when the Apostles and Evangelists were dead, if they had power to baptize only their own members? And this work, as there is occasion offered, lieth on Ministers still, for the office of the Apostles and Evangelists is ceased, and yet many remain still out of the Church. Indeed while the Churches of *New-England* constitute Churches of members already baptized, this difficulty appears not; but if they come to convert natives, how shall they be baptized but by an Officer of the Church-Catholike? for they are members of no Congregation, either they must admit them members of their own Congregation, and then baptize them, as their members, as I perceive their practice is, for which practice we finde no precept or precedent or intimation in Scripture, or else baptize them into the Church-Catholike, and then admit them members of their particular Congregations, and yet that will not stand with this opinion: or else they must grant them liberty to gather into a Church-Entitive (as some call it) and so make them capable of choosing Officers, and of being a political body before they be baptized; but neither will this stand with our brethrens principles: but should this latter be granted, who shall ordain a Pastor over them? Shall unbap-

tized persons lay on their hands on them? See more of this, Sect. 6.

Q. 2. S. 2.

Also the feeding and edifying of the body already converted, requires that this power of the ministerial function should be indefinite, for the minister of any particular Congregation through sickness or absence, or the like occasions, may not be able to afford sufficient spiritual food to his own people, neither Word, Sacraments, nor discipline, without the help of single fellow-labourers, or a combined, classical Eldership. What shall become of a Congregation in the intervals between the death of a former Pastor and the election of another? or who shall ordain him if he be elected? seeing all Officers of all particular Congregations in the world are but as private men to them, by this opinion.

The end of the Ministerial function is threefold, to convert into the visible Church, to convert into the invisible Church, and to edify such as are converted. Now this opinion cuts the two former ends quite off; for they suppose them both visibly and invisibly converted, before they think them fit matter for a Church, and so before admission into a particular Congregation, and then restrain the Ministers office only to the particular Congregation so constituted, so that his work is only to edify and govern such as are supposed to be truly godly, and train up their children. And by consequence it must follow that all conversion must be by men out of office, or at least as so considered. But *Pro. 9. 3.* Wisdom sends out her maidens to call in those that are without, *viz.* the simple and that want understanding. The Ministers by vertue of their office may exhort and entreat and summon in, to submit unto Christ, such as refuse and are unwilling, and such as against whom (they continuing perverse) they are to shake off the dust of their feet, for a witness against them. They are *μεγαλυνετο* under-suitors for the Bridegroom, *Joh. 3. 19.* to woo such as are of themselves unwilling, and to make motions for Christ to such as either heard not before of him, or had not before consented unto Christ.

Fourthly, It appears from the actions which every particular Minister doth perform, both in his own Congregation and out

Chap. 6.

of it. Every Minister doth in his own Congregation serve the Church-Catholike, by admitting members into the Church-Catholike, and by preaching the word to strangers that come to his Congregation, both fixed members of other Congregations, and such as are not fixed in any, and administering the Lords Supper to members of other Congregations, and in other Congregations by preaching or administering the seals there, upon a desire. And by excommunication they eject not only out of their own, but out of the whole. They also can keep lectures in other Congregations frequently. If it be objected, That this is occasionally done, and a charitable act and not an act of office. I answer, indeed charity and necessity may be the occasion of the performance thereof *pro hic & nunc*; but that cannot enable them to do it, if their office did not give them right and power habitually thereunto, no more then to private Christians.

It is observable what M. Ball in his *Trial of the new Church-Way* saith, p. 80. "That to suppose a Minister to be a Minister
"to his own Congregation only, and to none other society
"whatsoever, or to what respect soever, is contrary to the judg-
"ment and practice of the universal Church, and tendeth to
"destroy the unity of the Church, and that communion which
"the Church of God may and ought to have one with ano-
"ther. For if he be not a Minister in other Churches, then are
"not the Churches of God one, nor the Ministry one, nor the
"flock which they feed one, nor the communion one which
"they had each with others. Again p. 90. he saith, If a Minister
"may pray, preach, and bless another Congregation in the
"name of the Lord, and receive the Sacrament with them, we
"doubt not but he being thereunto requested by consent of
"the Pastor and the Congregation, he may lawfully dispense
"the seals among them, as need and occasion require. That
"distinction of preaching by office, and exercising his gifts on-
"ly, when it is done by a Minister, and desired of none but Mi-
"nisters, and that in solemn, set, constant Church-Assemblies, we
"cannot finde warranted in the word of truth, and therefore we
"dare not receive it.

The Ministers are the lights of the world, and though they stand like

like a light upon a particular Candlestick, yet are occasionally Sect. 6.
 to enlighten all that they can, either that come to them, or
 that they occasionally go among. Reverend M. Norton in his
 answer to Apollonius saith, this is *mediantibus candelabris Ecclesi-*
arum. His words are these, cap. 7. pa. 91. "*Nobis ergo iudicibus,*
Ministri ordinarij virtute muneris Ecclesiastici, sunt pastores
certis Ecclesijs, & mediantibus candelabris Ecclesiarum, mini-
stri unius creaturae, pro occasione dati, &c. But this concession
 is too narrow: for every Minister giveth light to others, not
 only as he standeth in his own Candlestick, viz. when others
 come to him; but also out of his Candlestick, when he goeth
 to them. And when he preacheth or administreth Sacraments
 abroad, he doth it not as the Minister of such a particular Con-
 gregation, but of the Church-Catholike; for the particular
 Congregation hath nothing to do to send an Officer to exercise
 his office in another Church, if it be confined and peculiar to
 that particular Congregation only, no more then a Corporati-
 on can send their Mayor to exercise his office in another Cor-
 poration, no not *charitativè*. It is therefore *mediante officio sine*
munere, by reason of the indefiniteness of his office, not of his
 particular station and relation, that he can dispense the Ordi-
 nances to other Congregations. M. Norton p. 80. acknowled-
 geth that a Minister hath *potestatem exercendi actus officij chari-*
tative, & modo debito, in alijs Ecclesijs, and that this mini-
 sterial power whereby he exerciseth such acts, in an Ecclesiasti-
 cal power, p. 81. and that it is Ecclesiastical, not only in regard
 of the dispenser and administrer (as it is when he preacheth to
 heathens) but in regard of the receivers or people to whom
 he doth dispense; and that Churches "*non tantum sub ratione*
Christianæ exercent communionem Christianam, sed etiam quâ
Ecclesia exercent communionem Ecclesiasticam inter seipsas,
& in seipsis ad invicem: quare etiam Ministri, præcipue cum
sine partes ejusdem totius organici, etiam quâ Ministri, actus
ministeriales officii in Ecclesijs non exercerent? And even from
 this concession of his (as I conceive) will necessarily follow
 that every Minister hath an indefinite, habitual, Ecclesiastical
 power, by vertue of his office in the whole Church-Catholike
 visible in *secundum organico*, which if it may be brought into
 act

Chap. 6.

act and exercise by charity, then much more by necessity, combination, mission or delegation, and if for the exercise of one key, why not of another, so it be in a due manner? They are the *Stewards of the mysteries of God*, 1 Cor. 4.1. and though by particular assignment they dispense the Ordinances to a particular company of Christs family, yet may not deny them to others of the family that have the same right thereto. They are *Spiritual fathers*, and do not only beget their own people to Christ ministerially, but strangers also. They are Christs *shepherds*, and are to neglect none of Christs sheep, as opportunity is offered, though they have a particular charge of a set flock.

When *M. Ellis* preached before the Parliament, did he preach as a private Christian, a gifted brother, or as a Minister? Surely they summoned him as a Minister, and heard him as a Minister: for they could have found many able Gentlemen members of Parliament, Lawyers or Citizens, who could have spent an hour or two in prayer, and exposition, and exhortation, but they never summoned any such to perform that work. Or had they summoned him to have been a member of the Reverend Assembly, would he have acted there as a private man, or as a Minister? Or do the dissenting brethren sit there as private men? or keep Lectures in *London* as private men?

Indeed skill, fitting endowments and willingnesse give a capacity to be called to the office, but Ordination and mission giveth habitual power, and a call giveth occasion of exercise thereof, and of drawing forth that power and office into act.

A private souldier may have as much skill to leade a Troop as a Captain, but he cannot do it authoritatively without a commission: so haply many private Christians are able to preach and govern in the Church, by reason of their skill, knowledge, wisdom and faithfulness, but cannot do it authoritatively, having no commission by office thereunto. And should such private men passe the censure against a scandalous brother that the Elders would do, yet it is not Ecclesiastical binding, yea, though such a scandalous person should referre himself to them as arbitrators, and promise to submit to their censure, yet they

they cannot Ecclesiastically excommunicate him, or restore him; Sect. 7.
no more then private men in an arbitration can condemn and execute a malefactor, or absolve him (though he be innocent) if indicted. Many times private men standing by, and hearing the evidence at the Assizes against a malefactor, will say he is but a dead man, yet that is no judicial condemnation of him, though it be materially according to the law of the land, yet it is not formally, for so is the act of the Judge only, who is in office for that purpose.

Fifthly, If private Christians bear a double relation, one to the Church Catholike visible as members thereof, and another to the particular Congregation where they are particular members, then so do the Ministers also. The universality of private Christians membership necessarily requires an universality of the ministerial office, for dispensing the Ordinances to them, though but occasionally. As particular members agree with other particular members in Christianity, so particular Ministers agree with other particular Ministers in the ministerial office. If particular private members can joyn with any Congregations in the Word, Sacraments, and praier, and are bound to contribute to them as members of the same general body (if there be need) though in forreign countries; then may also particular Ministers dispense the Ordinances of Jesus Christ as generally, if there be necessity or occasion. Epiphanius Bishop of Cyprus ordained a Deacon and Presbyter at Bethlehem, in monasterio Bethlemitico, in the jurisdiction of John Bishop of Jerusalem, when they were almost destitute of spiritual food, and defended his action thus. "*Oh Dei timorem hoc facere compulsi sumus, maxime quoniam nulla sit diversitas in sacerdotio Dei, & ubi utilitati Ecclesia providetur. Nam et si singuli Ecclesiarum Episcopi habent sub se Ecclesias quibus curam videntur imponere, & nemo super alienam mensuram extendatur, tamen praeponeatur omnibus charitas Christi.*" It seems he accounted his office habitually general, and though the order of the Church required him to keep within his own bounds ordinarily, yet necessity, the profit of the Church, and the love of Christ, might draw forth the execution of his office further.

He addeth further, *Non considerandum quid factum sit, sed*

Chap. 6.

"*quotempore, & quo modo, & in quibus, & quare factum sit, i.e. if it be not done to make a schism in the Church, as he expresseth himself afterward; neque feci quicquam ne Ecclesiam scinderem.* Afterwards he adds, "*Multis Episcopis communionis nostrae & presbyteros in nostrâ ordinaverunt Provincia. -- Ipse cohortatus sum beata memoria Philonem Episcopum, & S^m Theopropum ut in Ecclesiis Cyprî, quæ juxta se erant, ad unam antem paraciam Ecclesiam videbantur pertinere, ordinarent presbyteros, & Christi Ecclesie providerent.* Epiph. Epist. ad Johan. Hierolol. *quam Hieronymus lucinam fecit, Extra in Hieron. Ep. T. 2. & in Ep. Hiecon. ad Panmachum. T. 2. Vide Baronium Anno Christi 392. Sect. 42. Sec.*

The universal pastoral care which lieth on all Bishops as Bishops, saith Crakanthorp, puts forth it self both in general Councils; yea, and out of Councils this universal care of the Church lyeth upon all Ministers that they provide for the safety of the Church as much as lieth in them, *consulendo, hortando, monendo, arguendo, increpando, scriptis simul & voce alios omnes instruendo; & cum vel heresis ulla vel schisma in Ecclesia grassari ceperit, velut incendium publicum illud restringendo, & ne latius serpat providendo.* Def. Eccl. Angl. c. 28.

Sixthly, There will follow divers great absurdities, if the office of a Minister stands only in relation to his own Congregation. For then he cannot preach any where as a Minister but in his own Congregation, nor yet to any that come to his own Congregation occasionally, much less administer the seals of the Covenant to them, though they come never so well approved by testimonials, or by their own knowledge of them, which yet hath been the ancient custom of the Church, and is practised still among our brethren in New-England, by virtue of communion of Churches, as they say: but this being an act of office, cannot be done except there be an habitual, indefinite power of the ministerial office, which by this desire of strangers and their testimonial, is drawn forth into use.

Also hereby a Minister is rendered but as a private Christian to all the Christian world except his own Congregation, and if his Congregation be any way dissolved, he is but a private man again. Also the censure of excommunication which hath been

been inflicted by such Officers in such a Congregation can never be taken off by any other Officers in any other Congregation after the dissolution of that, for no Congregation can receive an excommunicated person to be a member before absolution; and absolve him they cannot, because he is none of their members; *Ejusdem est ligare & solvere*: yea, and if he be wronged by censures in any particular Congregation, no Church in the world can relieve him, except there be an indefinite, habitual power of office, which by such occasions can be drawn forth into act. It maketh way also for any private man to preach publicly if he be able, for Ministers themselves, by this opinion, should preach but as private men, if they preach out of their own Congregation. Also it necessarily implyeth that a Minister cannot remove from his particular Congregation, though for the great advantage of the Church, unless he will divest himself of his former Ordination (which was in reference only to his particular Congregation, by this opinion) and take a new Ordination to his Ministerial office again, as if he had never been ordained before. And all acting in Councils must be the actings of private Christians. And all the Lectures that are kept by neighbour-Ministers in combination, or singly (except by the particular Ministers of that Congregation where the Lecture is kept) are performed by private men, for so (by this opinion) they are to all the world, except their own Congregations. And so if any of their own members come and hear them preach at any such Lectures, Funerals, Marriages, or Baptizings, it is authoritative preaching indeed to them, because of their particular relation to him, but only a charitable exercising of gifts, as a private man out of office to all men else.

And if this opinion be true, what shall become of all the unfixed visible Christians in New-England? who by reason of their unresolvèdness, where yet to fix their civil habitations, or of scrupulosity or want of ability utterance, and boldness, to expresse themselves so as to obtain an admission into a particular Congregation, or haply though visible Christians under the seal of the Covenant, yet have not the inward true work of grace in them, yet are neither ignorant nor scandalous, but

Chap. 6.

live inoffensively, and willing to joyn in and submit unto all Gods Ordinances : I say, what shall become of them and their seed? Shall they all be left without the Church in Satans visible Kingdom, because they are no particular members, and there is no extension of the Ministerial office beyond the particular Congregations?

Sect. 8.

Obiect. If every Minister be a Minister of the Church Catholike visible, then what do they differ from Apostles and Evangelists, for that was their especial priviledge that their commission extended it self to all Churches? This Objection M. Bartlet hath in *Model* p.69.

Ans. There is this difference; Every minister hath by his Ordination power in *actu primo* to administer the Ordinances of God in all the Churches of the Saints, yet not in *actu secundo* without a special call. But the Apostles and Evangelists (which were *vicarij Apostolorum*) had both: and the Evangelists power was called forth by the Apostles, for they exercised their function where the Apostles appointed them. The Apostles received their office immediately from and by Christ: The Evangelists theirs from Christ by the Apostles: ordinary Ministers theirs from Christ indeed, but ministerially by the Presbytery. The Apostles and Evangelists were not fixed officers in any particular Congregation, but itinerant from place to place: ordinary Ministers are fixed in their own Congregations. They served the Church-Catholike actually wheresoever they became, and could draw forth the exercise of their offices without any mediate consent or call of the particular Churches or places, but so cannot particular ordinary Ministers. So that ordinary Ministers they are Ministers of the Church Catholike, though not Catholike Ministers actually. But if Ministers be Ministers only in their particular Congregations, where they are fixed, and to which they were called by the Congregation, I marvel that our brethren of the Congregational way here in *England* are so desirous to have itinerant Ministers to be sent into all parts of the land that shall be fastned to no particular Congregations: yea, and also to have gifted men, not ordained at all, to be suffered to preach publikely and constantly in Congregations; surely these things are not consistent with their principles.

CHAP. VII.

About Combinations of particular Congregations in Classes,
and of them in Synods.

A further question is about the combination of Congregations and Elderships in Classes and Synods. For though it cannot be denied but that particular Ministers in their particular Congregations do serve the Church-Catholike in their admissions, ejections, and other Ordinances, as preaching to, praying with, and administering Sacraments to members of other Churches, in their own meeting-houses, and upon occasion in other meeting houses, for the case is the same, whether they come to him, or he go to them; yet it may be doubted whether the Ministers and Elders may combine together, and jointly exercise acts of government, &c. And though this doth not necessarily belong to my question, yet because it hath some reference to the integrality of the Church-Catholike, I shall speak something of it.

Sect. I.

Now there is a double Integrality of the Church-Catholike, the first is *Entitive* whereby they are all bound together in the visible embracing, profession of, and subjection unto the visible doctrine, covenant, and laws of Christ, whereby they become Christians in the general, whereby all Christians are bound as opportunity is offered, to perform Christian duties one to another, as fellow-members, *ex officio charitatis generali*, not only by vertue of the moral law, but by the law of Christ, and to Christ as the King and head of his Church. As all dwelling within the kingdom of *England* are members of the Kingdom, and bound to carry themselves as subjects to the governours and laws, and as fellow-subjects one to another, though they be fixed members of no Corporations nor Townships. And this integrality is alwaies *actual*.

The second is as it is organical by combination, as all the Counties and Corporations and Towns by combination make one kingdom: so all the particular Christian Congregations,

Chap. 7.

Provinces and Kingdoms by combination make one Church-Catholike visible under Christ, and this is an habitual integrality. Of this it is that *Ames* speaks, the Church-Catholike in regard of the external state thereof, *Per combinationem habet suam integritatem*, Am. med. l. 1. c. 33. f. 18.

There is likewise a double combination, one habitual, whereby all Churches and Christians are united and habitually combined into one political Kingdom under Christ, and are obliged to be mutually helpful one to another, as need requires, as becometh fellow-subjects and fellow-members: secondly, there is actual combination, whereby any particular Churches shall actually agree, and so unite together for mutual help of each other, and for transactions of businesses of common concernment. And this is either a constant combination of vicinities in a Classis, because there will be constant cause; or occasional and more seldome, as of a whole Province or Nation, and may be of the whole Church-Catholike, if convenient by their delegates. This latter combination is *fundamentum exercitij*: by the former they have *jus ad rem*, by this latter they have *jus in re*, to a *Conjunctionem* for the good of those Churches so actually combined.

And of this second kinde of integrality and combination it is that we are now speaking, which necessarily ariseth from the former, as the organical integrality of a Kingdom ariseth from the Entitive. For seeing all are fellow-subjects under the same Sovereign and Laws, though they have particular Countreies, Corporations and Towns wherein they live, and actually enjoy constantly the general priviledges of subjects under the King and Laws, yet there will necessarily result a community and habitual integrality of the whole by coordinate combination.

The civil and Ecclesiastical combinations as they proceed from a parallel ground, viz. subjection to the same laws and Sovereign (I mean respectively) so they must necessarily run parallel in things that are general and essential to combination. Our brethren make them run parallel in the two first steps, viz. in combining particular persons into families, and particular families into Congregations of them that are *neighbourly*, dwell-

Secl. 2.

lers together in some vicinity, which is nothing else in English but Parishioners, the English word comes of the greek. The Christians dwelling together made one Church at *Jerusalem*, *Ephesus*, *Corinth*, &c. by Ecclesiastical combination, as well as one city by civil combination respectively. And I doubt not but if all the Inhabitants of any one Town in *New-England* were judged fit to be members of the Church, they would combine them as members of the Church in that Town, and that Town would give denomination to them all as the Church in or of such a Town. And seeing the subjects of Christs Ecclesiastical Kingdom runne parallel farther with the subjects of a civil Kingdom, they all being Christians, Why may not the combination also run parallel, and the denomination be parallel for transaction of common Ecclesiastical affairs, as well as civil, if prudence so dictate it? and the Churches in a hundred if they lie convenient, combine into a Classis as well, as into a hundred for civil transaction? And the Classes into a Province as well as hundreds into a County or Shire? and the Provinces into a national Church as well as the Counties into a civil Kingdom? and seeing Christs Ecclesiastical Kingdom reacheth over many Kingdoms, why may they not make one habitual Church-Catholike, as well as many Kingdoms under the same laws and head make one Empire? The actuality indeed may cease where the constant or frequent community of acting ceaseth, whether at the Congregation or Classis where all the Officers are combined in frequent common acting, or at the National Church where the civil community ceaseth, and so the frequent occasion of common acting by delegates cease, I determine not, but the habituality ceaseth not in the whole Church-Catholike visible.

I shall first speak of the combination of particular Congregations into a Presbyterial Church, commonly called for distinction sake a Classis. That there may be a college or body of Elders that can act *conjunctim* as well as *divisim*, appears from *1 Tim. 4. 14.* where the Presbytery are said to lay their hands on *Timothy*. There is the name and thing, and their acting *conjunctim* in Ordination, which was not the Presbytery of a single Church, or at least not so considered in their Ordination of an

Evangelist,

Secl. 2.

Chap. 7.

Evangelist, an itinerant, universal, actual officer under the Apostles. Our brethren also in *New-England* joyn the Elders of divers Congregations together in ordaining Elders for a new-erected Congregation, and not only the erecting of new Congregations will require it necessarily, but the supplying of other Congregations vacant by death, for there are but few Congregations so well stored with preaching Presbyters, as can ordain new ones, if one or two of them die. Also we finde an Eldership acting together, *Act. 15. 6. The Apostles and Elders came together to consider of this matter.* Also *Act. 11. 30.* and *Act. 21. 18.* Christ gave the keys to the Apostles together, *Mat. 28. 19. Go ye and teach and baptize, &c.* who though they received their extraordinary calling of Apostleship for themselves only, yet they received the ministerial office for all succeeding Ministers, and we finde no other especial donation of the keys; and this appears by the following words, *Lo I am with you alway even to the end of the world;* which must needs be meant of the succeeding Ministers, for the Apostles were not to last to the end of the world, neither their persons nor their office. Therefore as the Apostles could from that donation exercise the keys *conjunctim & divisim* in their extraordinary function, so may the Presbyters exercise theirs also, and some keys cannot be used but *conjunctim*; as in Ordination and dispensing censures: and if Elders of several Congregations can act together as Elders in ordination (even in *New-England*) and in censures, much more then in a greater body. And if our brethren in *New-England* dared admit private men to lay on their hands in ordination of their Ministers, doubtlesse they would appoint some of their own private members to do it, that so (according to their tenet) they might enjoy all Gods Ordinances independently in their particular Congregations, and not admit of a foreign Officer to come and act as an Officer among them.

That divers Congregations may combine and make one Presbyterial Church, appears by divers instances in the New Testament. The Congregations in *Jerusalem* are called one Church, *Act. 8. 1. Act. 11. 22. Act. 15. 4.* The Congregations in *Antioch* are called one Church *Act. 13. 1.* and *Act. 14. 26.* The Congregations

gations in *Ephesus* are called one Church, *Act.* 20.17. *Rev.* 2.1. Sect. 3. And the Congregations in *Corinth* mentioned in the plural number, *1 Cor.* 14. 34. are called one Church, *1 Cor.* 1. 2. and *1 Cor.* 1. 1. Now that there were several Congregations in each of these cities appears, because there were in each of them so great a multitude of beleivers, as that they could not meet together to partake of all Gods Ordinances, especially if we consider that they had no publike eminent buildings for meeting-houses, but met privately *ut dicitur Act.* 2. 46. in an upper room, *Act.* 1. 13. and in the house of *Mary*, *Act.* 12. 12. in the school of *Tyrannus*, *Act.* 19. 9. in the house of *Aquila* and *Priscilla*, *1 Cor.* 16. 19. in *Pauls* hired house at *Rome*, *Act.* 28. 30. in the house of *Nymphas*, *Colof.* 4. 15. &c. therefore called the Church in their houses. And this manner of meeting continued in the times of persecution in that age, and some succeeding.

Also it appears by the multitude of Church-Officers, Elders, Prophets and Teachers that were in each of them, which could not busie themselves in one Congregation, and sure they were not idle in those daies. Also by the variety of languages, especially at *Jerusalem*, *Act.* 2. 5, 8. &c. See these and other arguments of this nature more fully explained, and more particularly proved and applied in *3rd Div.* part. 2. chap. 13.

And if these Churches were such (as in all rational probability they were) then that position, That there are no other Ecclesiastical societies instituted by Christ but particular Congregational Churches, will not hold good; and the Basis of the Congregational way will fail, and the partition wall that seemeth thereby to be between them and the Presbyterians, must fall down.

And this unity of these Churches was not a spiritual unity in regard of saving grace, for all the members had not that; nor in regard of judgement, belief, heart and way, for that was common to all the Christians in the world: but a political union by an especial Ecclesiastical obligation together (though we finde no mention of any explicit Covenant, as the constituent form of the particular Churches) nor only in regard of the administration of Word, Sacraments and Praier, for these

Chap. 7.

were dispersed in their several Congregations, and could not be jointly together in regard of their multitudes. Neither were they one in reference to the Apostles general power and office only, they being universal Pastors; for so the universal Church over the whole world was one; but in regard of the common Presbytery whereby they were governed constantly, and the Apostles themselves being in these several Churches did act as co-Presbyters with their Elders, and so they call themselves Elders, *1 Pet. 5. 1.* and *Joh. 2.* And though indeed it cannot be peremptorily affirmed, that these Presbyterial Churches had their several Elders fixed to their several Congregations; yet that (as I conceive) varies not the question at all. And yet it is very probable that the Elders in those cities did divide those cities between them, for particular teaching and inspection of manners, to avoid confusion, and for a better means of conversion and edification of the whole, that so the members and others might the better know where they should be baptized, taught and instructed (so far I mean as the persecutions and dangers of those times would permit) and yet for more weighty matters of ordination, excommunication, or confuting any heresies, or transacting any business of general concernment they did meet together.

Now that these several Presbyterial Churches had each of them a common Presbytery set over them to govern in common, appears for *Jerusalem*, by *Act. 11. 27, 30* and *Act. 15. 2.* and at *Antioch* by *Act. 13. 1, 2, 3.* with *Act. 15. 35.* and at *Ephesus* by *Act. 20. 17, 28.* and at *Corinth*, *1 Cor. 1. 12.* and *1 Cor. 4. 15.* and *14. 29.* and at *Philippi*, *Phil. 1. 1.*

And not only Scripture proves it in the practice, but right reason and necessity requires that there should be a combination of particular Congregations, for the attaining the end for which government was appointed, both because there are many things that jointly concern many particular Congregations, and therefore it is fit they should be transacted in common: as also some particular Congregations are too weak to perform some things that may concern themselves, as probation and ordination of their own Ministers, and censuring of persons of great external power, or civil dignity; the resolving of diffi-

cule controversies, and cases of conscience; the confuting of Sects 24
 subtle and dangerous errors, and learned subtle hereticks. There
 may also be through mens weaknesse and corruption, male-ad-
 ministration or presumption thereof in a particular Congrega-
 tion, which without combination and appeal cannot be reme-
 died. There may also fall out a difference between the Congre-
 gation and their particular Presbytery, and then who shall de-
 cide it? yea, the very Presbytery in a Congregation may differ,
 and be equally divided among themselves, and who shall de-
 cide that difference? There may be some great difference be-
 tween one Congregation and another Congregation, and they
 being equal in authority as Congregations are, *Par in Parem*
non habet imperium, who then shall end these differences, if both
 be resolute, and will not yeeld each to other, or to the advice,
 counsel and perswasion of neighbour Churches? Therefore it
 is necessary that there be an authoritative conjoynd Pres-
 bytery, wherein the whole hath power to regulate the parts;
 the greater part of the body to heal and help the lesse, either
 in keeping them from division, or to cure them of divisions, when
 they are risen.

Sometime again many neighbour Congregations are scan-
 dalized by some notorious evil breaking out in one Con-
 gregation, or their members endangered by the evil example
 of some persons dwelling in one of the neighbour Congregati-
 ons, and having recourse unto, and converse with the members
 of the rest, and haply that Congregation cannot, will not, or
 do not censure that offendour: shall there be no means to
 bring him to censure, and afford a remedy for the rest? Some
 heretick may endanger the members of divers Congregations,
 and yet live but in one, and that one not able (haply) to grapple
 with him; or haply he be a fixed member of none (as may easily
 fall out, especially if Churches consisted only of gathered mem-
 bers, as some would have them) or one that shifteth up and down
 to avoid Congregational censure, how shall he be dealt withal,
 without combination of Churches?

Sometimes the offendour or scandalous person is a member
 of one Congregation, and the witnesses live in two or three
 neighbour Congregations, how shall this mans cause be brought

Chap. 7.

to trial? The Elders of that Congregation where the accused person dwelleth cannot authoritatively send for witnesses out of another, and if they will come voluntarily, they cannot (by our laws) safely administer an oath unto them: neither can the Elders where the witnesses dwell send for the accused person authoritatively, nor censure him if he will come voluntarily. And yet many such like cases may, and will fall out, If all civil causes were confined to the trial of the chief men in the several Parishes, we should soon finde the difficulty, disability, mischief, and impossibility thereof, and the case is the same for Ecclesiastical causes, for ought I know. "There is no way (saith M. *Rutherford*) to reduce or judge scandalous, dissenting Elders without there be a combination; for they will not censure themselves, and the people cannot. *Peaceab.* "Plea, 191. But (saith he) the spirits of the Prophets must be judged by the Prophets, 1 Cor. 14. 39 And otherwise we must leave all scandalous Elders to the immediate judgement of Christ.

Sect. 3.

But still there remaineth a greater Query about Synods consisting of delegated Officers of particular Churches, which because they are most properly *Ecclesiastica*, I shall say the lesse of them, as being not so pertinent to my question, it being about the whole Church, consisting of both Officers and private members respectively. Concerning Synods and the subordination of the particular Churches unto them, divers have written so fully, learnedly, and punctually, that I shall referre the reader to them. See M. *Paget* in his defence of Church-government, par. 2. and of the power of Classes and Synods, ch. 6. And M. *Gillespies* Assertion of the government of the Church of Scotland. And the four *Leiden Professors*, Synops. purior. Theolog. disp. 49. The advice of our Reverend Assembly concerning a Confession of faith and a form of Church-government. And *Jus Divinum* by the London Ministers. And M. *Parkers* Polit. Eccl.

The nature of Synods is all one, whether they be Provincial, National or Oecumenical, and they only differ as greater or lesse, but their power in reference to their precincts, and delegation is alike. They differ from Presbyteries called Classes, because the Provincial is constituted only of certain delegated members

members from the classcal Presbyteries of the same Province: Sect. 3.
the *National* of delegated members from the Provincial Synods: and the Oecumenical of delegated members from the National Synods: whereas the *Classis* is constituted of the Elders of the particular Congregations combined together. The *Classes* are more frequent, constant, and ordinary in their meetings, the other more rare and extraordinary. The power of *Synods* is not at all civil, but Ecclesiastical, neither is it destructive to the power of *Classes*, or single Congregations, but perfective and conservative. They are not infallible, but may erre as well as a *Classis*, or single Eldership, yet are not so subject thereto, because in the multitude of Counsellours there is safety, and they consist of more choice able men, and not so liable to personal prejudice against the accused, nor likely to be swayed by fear, or favour, or sinister respects. Their power is not meerly consultatory and suasive, but authoritative, and to be submitted unto by those for whom their delegation is, so farre as their acts are according to the word of God, *In Synodo est authoritatis apex, totius Ecclesie unitas, ordinis firmitas*, *Leid.* profes. de concil. If it be no more but consultatory and suasive, that is no more then a few private men may do, yea, one man or woman may counsel, advise and perswade. By M. Ellis's opinion Councils and Synods being void of all authority are but as a company of private Christians met together to advise one with another how to act in their own Congregations, where only (saith he) they are in office: it may be an act of those that are in office but not as Officers, so that in that act they are to be considered as private members, who by such consultation take or give private advice how to act as officers, where they are Officers. Which is no otherwise then if in these times of trouble and danger, a company of periconstabiles should meet occasionally, or by appointment together at a market-town, and there consult together how to act most commodiously and uniformly in their severall Parishes, in the pressing of Souldiers, or gathering Assesments: or a company of Mayors of severall Corporations should meet by appointment at *London*, and there advise together, how to order their severall Corporations. So that a *Synod* whether *Provincial*,

Chap. 7.

National, or Oecumenical, can have no power to summon any heretick or scandalous person, and if any such should voluntarily come before them, or be brought before them by the civil Magistrate, that should before their faces blaspheme the whole Trinity, or be convicted of *Sodomy*, yea, though any of their own members should curse God himself, or be convicted of a present act of *whoredom*, or of *sojcery*, they have no power to censure him Ecclesiastically, but fraternally admonish him, and send him back to his own Congregation to be censured, and they themselves only go thither as witnesses against him, because they are there (by this opinion) out of office, and all censures belong to the particular Elderships, as particular. But suppose now this heretick or scandalous person being departed (haply) from the Congregation where formerly he lived, or that Congregation being dissolved be a fixed member of no Congregation (as ten thousands of visible Christians, i. e. that have received the doctrine of Christ, and are under the seal of Baptism, may be, if particular Churches consist only of such as can give evidence of the work of true grace in themselves) shall he remain an entive member of Christs visible kingdom, a gangreened limb, a rebel and traitour under the name and notion of a subject, and infect the rest of the body, and there be no remedy?

Sect. 4.

But as the subject matters that *Synods* have to deal with are of three sorts, so their power and the acts of it which they put forth are of three sorts likewise. First, they are to act in reference to matters of faith, i. e. doctrines to be beleaved and embraced, and of divine worship, i. e. duties of worship to be performed unto God: not to coin or frame, or addé any new articles of faith, or new acts of worship, or alter any that God hath instituted: but to explain, prove and apply those Articles of faith, and rules of worship laid down in the word, and to confute and declare against the contrary errours, heresies, and corruptions; and the power they exert herein is called *dogmatical*. Secondly, they are to act in reference to external order and polity in matters prudential and circumstantial, which are determinable by the true light of nature, right reason, and general rules in the Scripture: to set things in order, that all things

things may be done uniformly, decently, and in order: and the power they exert herein is called *diastical*. Thirdly, they are to act in reference to error, heresie, schism, obstinacy, contempt and scandal, and to repress them, and to censure such persons as are guilty of any of them, and are referred over to them: and the power they exert herein is called *criminal*. Sect. 4.

This is none other power then the particular Elderships in their severall Congregations or Classes may exert in their sphere and precincts, with submission to the superiour assemblies, and all must be according to the word of God. As in the natural body God hath set severall senses to act upon the severall sensible objects, visible, audible, tactile, &c. and severall faculties in reference to truth and falsehood, good and evil, to discern and embrace the one, and avoid the other: so in the body Ecclesiastical hath he set severall powers in the organs thereof to act diversly, according to the occurrent objects and incidents in the Church, both in the particular Congregations for the good of them, and in greater parts of the body for the good of them, and in the whole if convenient, for the good of that: but because remote parts cannot meet personally and generally in all their Officers, therefore that trouble and confusion is avoided by delegation of particular elected choice officers, and is but occasionally, and *pro tempore*.

A ground and pattern of a Synod is laid down Act. 15. and 16. which is acknowledged to be a Synod, and warrant for a Synod by reverend M. Cotton in his *keys of the kingdom of heaven*, cha. 6. And is called an Oecumenical Council by *Chamier in Pantheon*, Tom. 2. lib. 10. cap. 8. sect. 2. and *Whimk* cont. qu. 6. And generally by our Protestant Divines. And is abundantly proved and explained by the London Ministers in their *Two Divinings*, par. 2. chap. 14. and 15. to which I referre the reader for satisfaction.

The occasion of that Synod was an error broached at Antioch, and neighbour-Churches, to enforce the observation of the ceremonial Law by all Christians, and this was promoted by lying, as if they were sent by the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem to preach this doctrine. Hereby the Churches were much troubled, and in danger to be subverted in their souls. This could not be suppressed by the disputes of Barnabas and Paul:

Chap. 7.

Paul: hereupon the Elders of *Antioch* decreed and ordained (*ἐταξάν*) that *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and some others, should go up to the *Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem* about this question, and they submitted to this order, there was an authoritative mission, and probably members were also sent from *Syria* and *Cilicia*, for they were involved in the same danger, by the same persons, *Act.* 15. 23, 24, 41. But if there were delegates but from two Churches, it will justify delegates from ten or twenty.

And as the Church of *Antioch* did not send *Paul* and *Barnabas* as extraordinary and infallible and authentical Oracles of God, as *M. Cotton* noteth, for then what need the advice and help of Elders that were below them, being but ordinary and particular Officers of *Jerusalem*? But as wise and holy guides of the Church, who might not only relieve them by some wise counsel and holy order, but also set a precedent to succeeding ages, how errors and dissensions in Churches might be removed and healed. And with *Paul* and *Barnabas* they joyned others messengers in the same commission. So when this Synod was met, the Apostles acted not by their Apostolical, infallible, transcendent power, or by immediate inspiration, as in the penning of the Scripture; but the matters were carried on in an ordinary Synodal way by disputes and discourses, they deliberated about the true state of the question, and the remedy thereof, and after deliberation and disputes, they decisively conclude and determine the matter, and put forth all the three fore-named powers. First, they exert their *dogmatick* power in confuting of the heretic, and in vindication of the truth of justification by faith, without the works of the law: and their *critical* power in branding the false teachers with the infamous brand of troublers of the Church, and subverters of souls, and of belyars of the Apostles and Elders of *Jerusalem*: and their *dianethick* power in ordering and framing practical rules or constitutions for the healing of the scandal. They passed τὰ δόγματα *Act.* 16. 4. they imposed them, for they are said ἐμπίθεσαν *Act.* 15. 28, 29. yet were not all the things they imposed necessary in themselves, as abstaining from things strangled and from blood: they are called necessary not *intrinsically*, for then

they are so to us but for that time, because those things were so odious to the Jews, who could not be so suddenly brought from all ceremonies. Sect. 5.

It is true our Divines in their writings against the Papists do cry down the infallibility of Councils, and the over-high esteem they had of them, and the injurious and sinful decrees of their Popish Councils, but they honour the general Councils, and account Synods an Ordinance of God. *Calv. Inst. lib. 4. cap. 9. sect. 13.* saith, "*Nos certe libenter concedimus, si qua de dogmate incidat disceptatio, nullum esse nec melius nec curius remedium, quam si verorum Episcoporum Synodus conveniat, ubi controuersum dogma excutitur. Multo enim plus ponderis habebit ejusmodi definitio in quam communiter Ecclesiarum pastores, invocato Christi Spiritu, consenserint, quam, &c.*"

Whitak. de consilijs cap. 2. not only alloweth but commendeth Synods and Councils from the necessity and utility of them, and marvelleth that *Nazianzen* should say he never saw a good end of a Synod, alledging the good end and profit of the Council of *Nica*. And citeth *Augustine* in *Ep. 118. Conciliorum in Ecclesia Dei saluberrimam auctoritatem esse*. And addeth further, *Etsi Concilia non sunt simpliciter & absolute necessaria, tamen multum conferunt, & valde utilia sunt, idque propter multas causas*. And then reckons up the causes. And divideth Synods in *remotis & diuiniis*. And bringeth *Act. 15.* for an example and warrant of them.

And *Chamier* in his *Panstrat. tom. 2. lib. 10. cap. 8. De omnium toto orbe Ecclesiarum politica*, sheweth the lawfulness and use of Synods. And *lib. 5.* saith, *Ad Synodos convocatos fuisse atque admissos omnes Episcopos nemo dubitat, sed etque judices, suo jure, prout fieri solet in Aristocratia*. And *M. Parker* in *Polis. Eccl. l. 3. p. 355.* saith, *Fundatur hac progressio a Presbyterio ad Classem, a Classi ad Synodum, in instituto Christi, Mat. 18. 17. ex proportionem*. And *p. 123.* he foundeth them upon the same Scripture, *Per gradationem ratiocinandi*: a little after he saith they follow from that place, *per sequelam ratiocinandi, & per consequentiam*. Innumerable might be the citations of Protestant Divines in this kinde.

It is confest, that particular Churches are endued with the power Sect. 5.

Chap. 7.

power of discipline within themselves, if the matter doth particularly and peculiarly concern themselves, and none others: or if there be no others that can joyn with them, they may do much alone, but that case is extraordinary.

It is confest also that every single Congregation is equal in power to any other single Congregation, considered as a Church, only one may be greater and purer then another, and furnished with more and more able officers. And therefore how one sister Church by its single power can non-communicate another, that is of equal power with it, I know not, for it is a censure, and no less then a virtual excommunication: and the other Church hath as much power to non-communicate them, and so there is a principle laid of perpetual and frequent division, and splitting asunder of Christs political body and kingdom. Such a principle in a Common-wealth between Town and Town in civil affairs would be very dangerous, and bring deadly feuds and civil wars, and at last ruine to the whole.

And though there be a subordination of particular Churches to greater Assemblies, yet it is not absolute and arbitrary, but in the Lord: also it is a coordination, because the Officers of the particular Congregations are there, and help to constitute the *Classis*, or if it be a *Synod* they are virtually there by their delegates or Commissioners, as the Countiees and Corporations are in a Parliament.

The subordination of particular Congregations to greater Assemblies, consisting so of members taken out of the particular Congregations, and the authoritative power and Ecclesiastical jurisdiction of those greater Assemblies over them appears, because we see the Church of *Amster* was subordinate to the Synod at *Jerusalem*, Act. 15. Also Christs direction to deal with an offending brother, *Mat. 18.* ascends by degrees from private admonition to admonition before two or three, and from them if he amend not, to the Church: but what if the greater number of a Church, or suppose a whole Church offend? by the same rule of proportion they are to be brought before a higher Assembly, else no remedy can be had for offending Congregations, as well as offending persons. But neighbour Congregations or particular persons may be offended by a neighbour

bour Church, and there is no reason that that Church should be Sect. 5.
partee and judge also in their own case; and therefore it is re-
quisite that there should be a greater combined Assembly to
complain unto.

And as the unity of the whole visible Church and political
Kingdom of Christ requires this, as the *London-Ministers* have
well noted, wherein all things are to be managed as between
members and fellow-subjects, and the greater part in coordina-
tion to rule the lesse in the Lord, and the whole the parts: so
also there is the same necessity of *Synods* as of *Classical* com-
binations, and otherwise there will be irremediable difficul-
ties.

Also we may observe the like subordination and appeals in
the Jewish Church: the several Synagogues were subordinate
to the great Assembly at *Ierusalem*, and had their appeals thi-
ther in greater causes, *Deut.* 17.8, 12. *2 Chron.* 19.8, 11. *Exo.* 18.
22, 26. And this could not be a ceremonial Law, for it did ty-
pifie nothing. The appeals were not to the high Priest, typify-
ing Christ, but to their highest Court: and though it were ju-
dicial to them, yet the equity of it remains, and so far as it was
grounded on common right it is moral. Now the like diffi-
culties and dangers that occasioned that Law then, remain
still as great among us, and ever will. And it is observable that
this thing was not learned by *Moses* in the pattern shewed him
in the Mount, but was taught by the light of nature to *Iethro*,
and by him was given in advice to *Moses*, *Exo.* 18. 22. and af-
terward was approved by God, as being according to right
reason, and a thing common to all societies as societies, not Ec-
clesiastical only, and not a positive law only, but dictated by
the light of nature, right reason and necessity, and therefore is
practised in all ages, nations, armies and societies, though not
in every particular circumstance. And therefore except it were
forbidden, or some other way instituted to avoid those difficul-
ties and dangers that will arise, it ought to be in use also in the
Church under the Gospel, as well as summoning, convening in
fitting times and places, and a moderatour or chair-man, and
silence, obedience and respect, and due order in proceedings ac-
cording to allegation and probation, which are things com-

Chap. 7.

mon to all Judicatories, as Judicatories. And surely God would not have Christians under the Gospel under a more grievous yoke, and irremediable inconveniences then the Jewish Church, that if any of them be oppressed by the ignorance, or ill will of their Elders, they should have no relief.

Self. 6.

Obj. If there be appeals from one Presbytery to another that is higher, then must there be two kindes of Presbyteries, and two kindes of Presbyters; but the Scripture speaks but of one, and giveth no rules for any Presbyteries, but one. Indeed in Universities the same men may be heads of the Colleges respectively, and heads of the Universitie also; but there are differing and distinguishing names, relations, and Statutes: but it is not so for Elders of particular Congregations to be Elders of Classes and Synods, &c.

Answ. The Church is but one visible, political Kingdom of Christ, made up by the collection and aggregation of all visible beleivers, who are called into an unity of Covenant, and laws, and way: and all the Ministers and Officers of the Church are given to the whole primarily, for the gathering and edifying of it, and they are all to teach and rule, and perform all their administrations respectively, with reference to, and the best advantage of the whole. And they did serve the whole as one actually when they were convenible, but their number encreasing they divided into several companies, for their better ordering, edification and encrease: and therefore the instance is not parallel, for the office of the Ministers is first to the whole, and the Charter and Statutes of the whole and of every particular Church are but one: and therefore the Ministers though they ordinarily act in their particular Congregations, as it were in their particular Colleges, being called by them to take the immediate, constant, particular inspection of them, yet can they exercise their general office when and wheresoever they have a call thereunto. Now this call is not that which giveth them their office, but is *proximum fundamentum exercitii* only. Neither is the particular Congregation the adequate correlate to an Elder, for it doth not *minime ponere & tollere*, but the Church-Catholike only. But of this see more in the 2^d question. S. 4.

But against this *M. Ellis* vind. 40. brings an Objection which Sect. 6. he ushers in with a *Let it be observed by all fores*, "By this means (saith he) the power being given not to any one Church, but to the whole Church as one body, and not to the members with the Officers, but to the Officers only, there is derived a very transcendent power and authority upon every particular Minister, more then any Parliament man hath, yea, more then a King, who is limited to his dominion.

But I answer, that the Presbyterians acknowledge that power of government is given immediatly to every Congregational Elderhip, or at least to such a College of Elders as may frequently and constantly meet and rule in common, as they did at *Jerusalem*, and it is not derived unto them by any superiour authority on earth, by way of descension, except by a Ministerial investment by Ordination. And this power is to be constantly exerted for the actual, Ecclesiastical regiment of that Congregation, or those Congregations over whom those Elders are set in the Lord, yet with reference to the rest of the body, whereof they are but a parcel, and they may stand in need of the help of more Elders then their own, upon occasion.

It is true, government is not given to the members with the Officers, but to the Officers only: not to the body of the Congregation as the subject of it; either in whole or in part, as they are private members distinct from the Officers, much lesse are they the *μεγίστην ἐκκλησίαν*, or first receptacle thereof.

And for the inference hence of such a transcendent power and authority upon every particular Minister more then a Parliament man or a King. I suppose *M. Ellis* is not ignorant that the office of every particular Minister in his Congregation giveth him authority to do more in administering Gods Ordinances, (as authoritative preaching, and administering the seals of the Covenant, and the Officers in administering spiritual censures) then a Parliament man or a King can do. Remember *Ozziab's* example. And yet in all civil affairs they are as dutiful subjects as any else, and as much subject to civil authority. Because the *Priests* and *Levites* were in the matters of God

Chap. 7.

set over all *Israel*, will it therefore follow that the meanest *Le-vite* was greater then the *Nobles*, *Princes* and *Kings* of *Israel*? Indeed the meanest *Priest* might offer sacrifice, which the *King* could not do, but this was no disparagement to the *Nobles* or to the *King*. No more it is to them that the meanest *Physician* may administer physick *virtute officij*, and the meanest *Pilot* guide the *Ship*, which the greatest *Princes* may not doe. The office and power and honour that belong thereto is of another kinde, then *Parliaments* and *Kings*, it is not civil but spiritual. You know Gods Ministers have power to baptize *Parliament men*, *Nobles* and *Kings*, and their children, and to give them the *Lords Supper*, and to teach, admonish, reprove, and from God to threaten and denounce judgements against them, even eternal destruction, if they go on in sinful courses. They do doctrinally binde and loose *Princes*, and their whole Kingdoms, and the whole world, as occasion serveth. And can any man say that the greatest men are by their greatnesse free from Church-censures, if they be notoriously vile? and yet none can impose them but Ecclesiastical Officers. Suppose divers *Parliament men* or Noble men, yea, a *King* himself were members of a Congregational Independent Church, would not the Officers of that Congregation account it their duty to administer all Gods Ordinances to them, as occasion requires, yea, the Ordinances of discipline and censures, if there be just cause?

Sir, would you now be willing to have a retortion of your own kinde? with a *Let it be observed by all sorts*; that by the Independent way power is given to 2. or 3. Officers in a Congregation (or as others of them say, if the particular Congregation joyn) to censure, yea, excommunicate *Parliament men*, *Nobles* and *Kings*, if they judge there be cause, and all the Churches in the world shall have no power to relieve them, except that Congregation, or those Elders please.

"It makes (saith M. *Elie*) every Minister one of the standing Officers of the Christian world, to whom with his colleagues (not severally and by distribution, but jointly and as one body) is committed the government of the whole Christian world, and managing the affairs of the son of God throughout
"the

"the face of the earth. And this is marked with (") as if these Sect 6.
were the very words of the Presbyterians, which are but his
own paraphrase and collection, and not their sense, much lesse
their words.

But I answer, Every Ministers office is habitually indefinite,
but he is not actually a standing Officer of the Christian world.
But as a *Physician* by this calling profession and license, is a *Physi-*
cian to the whole world habitually, and may act upon the bod-
ies, and about the lives of men, of what nation soever, where
and when he hath a call. And as a *Lawyer* is a *Lawyer* to the
whole Kingdom, and hath power by his call to the bar to deal
about any mans case or estate (so far as the Law alloweth,
and his calling serveth) where and when he is required, and
yet these are but professions, not offices, which would make the
habitual power haply more reducible into act, upon a lawful
call: but Christs Ministers have an indefinite habitual office,
beyond their particular Congregations, yet in regard of exert-
ing and constant exercise thereof, it is distributively over their
own flocks, which are as their constant Patients and Cli-
ents, but if there be necessity, just occasion, and a call to
be helpful to any others joyntly with them that have the same
office, they may exercise their power in any part of the whole
body.

"And so (saith M. Ellis) he is one of Christs vicars general
"(and not particular only, which I acknowledge every Minister
"to be in his place) *magnum* surely & *memorable* *nomen*. But
this is but *magnum* & *memorable* *scemma*, and so I passe it by.
M. Ellis knows that this power though habitually it belongeth
to the office, and so to the person that hath that office, yet is
not drawn forth in a general Councel for the actual, immediate
service of the whole Church, once in many hundred years;
and divers generations of Ministers die, and it is not called forth
in their ages; and when it is, they are usually the most able and
eminent persons that have that call, and not one of many hun-
dreds of them neither, therefore that scoff might well have been
spared.

But he confesseth every particular Minister in his place to be
Christs Vicar (as he terms him) i. e. to act *vice Christi*, and
all

Chap. 7.

all distributively to be Christs Vicars general. I see he is not sublimated so high (as some are) as to make the Ministers to be the Vicars or Stewards of the Congregation, and to carry their keys for them. But can they act *vice Christi* no where else? in whose name doe they preach, baptize, administer the Lords Supper, and blesse the people, when they act abroad occasionally? This ariseth from that principle (disclaimed in all former ages of the Church) that a Minister is a Minister, but in his own Congregation, and out of office to all the Church besides.

Sect. 7.

But M. Ellis hath another Objection against it, *viz.* "If it be so (saith he) great reason it is that the Church of the whole world should choose these universal Officers, and so the Church of a Nation the National Officers, &c. by whom they are to be governed in that which is dearest and of highest moment, *viz.* the precious soul, or else their condition is most sad.

Ans. Is there not the same reason that the whole world should have a hand in the choice of every Physician? and the whole Kingdom of every Lawyer? And by the same reason it will follow, that the whole Christian world should have a consent in the admitting of every member of the Church, seeing they be members not of the particular Congregation only, into which by particular association they are admitted, but of the whole Church-Catholike visible. But as every Minister is entrusted with the admitting of members into the whole, and every Eldership with casting out of the whole: so may every conjoynd Presbytery be also with the admittance of an Officer. It is impossible that the whole Church should meet about admittance either of members or Officers, but the particular parts are entrusted in the places where they live: and if any man or woman can give in any just exception against either member or Minister, that is to be admitted, it shall debar their admission, or procure an ejection.

The new Jerusalem Rev. 21. is said to have 12. gates, and there was an admission into the whole city by every gate: so is there admission into the whole Church by baptism in every Congregation. The Temple spoken of in Ezek. 40. &c. is conceived

ceived to typifie the Evangelical Church in general, and the several chambers the particular Congregations: now as those that were admitted into any chamber had thereby admission into the whole house, so they that are admitted in any Congregation, are admitted into the whole Church. And though the admission of particular Officers or members is not done *inter-veniens totius Ecclesie*, yet it is done *inveniens totius Ecclesie*, with reference and respect had to the whole.

But secondly I answer, That when that habitual power is drawn into act in a particular Congregation, as their particular Minister, then that Congregation meets to give him a call: and if an unworthy, unskilful man get into the profession of Physick or Law, for all his habitual power by license, he may have patients and clients few enough to call his power into act: the like may be said of an unworthy Minister, if Churches have their right of calling or approving their Ministers. Or if there be a call to act in a *Synod*, so great a part of the Church as the *Synod* extends unto, have a hand to call to that action. Indeed in a *Classis* the whole vicinity of Officers may meet personally by their actual combination, but if it be a *provincial Synod*, every *Classis* in the Province chooseth the members thereof severally: if in a *National Synod* every Province chooseth and calleth the members thereof, and so there is a call of the whole Kingdom: and if it be a general Council of the whole Church, all the Christian Nations elect and call the members thereof respectively: and so this sadnesse he speaks of is salved.

"And for unworthy persons intruding into the Church by a little learning, to live idly on the sweat and cost of others, or that shall have a friend, patron, or purse to make one, and so come into the Ministry and a living; which (saith he) is the Kings road in some Churches the Presbyterians abhor it as much as he.

"But such an one (saith he) shall become a Parliament-man, and joynt governour of the whole Church on earth, by whose one vote all the liberties and truth of religion in them may be destroyed. This is another scoff, in calling every Minister, though unworthily crept in, a parliament man, and joint governour of the whole Church on earth.

Chap. 7.

But Sir, your passions make you forget your self much. It is not to be actually such a Parliament-man and joynt governour, but habitually capable to be occasionally chosen *pro tempore*, into a *Provincial, National, or Oecumenical Council*. And is it not as great danger in a kingdom, that any man, though of never so mean breeding, or vicious life, if he get wealth or honour by hook or crook, shall be capable to be chosen a Parliament-man, and by his vote (only, as it may be) all the civil liberties of a kingdom may be destroyed? Any Gentleman or Knight though he hath not an habituality, yet hath a potentiality to be a Parliament-man, which is reducible into act as well as if it were an habituality. And proportionably there are forty nay five hundred Gentlemen chosen to be members of Parliaments, for one Minister chosen to be a member of an *Oecumenical Council*.

"A glimpse whereof (saith he) we have seen in the Convocations or Synods in our own Nations. But when did M. Ellis see a Presbyterial Convocation or Synod in our own Nation? Prelatical Convocations and Synods indeed we have seen and felt, but no Presbyterial ones. And therefore his second sadness might have been spared.

"O but none (saith he) attains the honour of being an universal Officer, a Parliament man, but by the consent (formal or virtual) of all or the major part of them. And therefore the condition of the Church is more sad then the condition of men in their civil liberties in this kingdom.

Answer. I pray wherein? For as the free-holders in the kingdom choose Parliament men for themselves, their wives, children and servants, and all the copholders, and meaner poor people in their severall Counties, which are farre the greater number: so the Ministers and Elders, whom the Congregations have chosen and entrusted over them in the Lord, doe formally or virtually choose all the members of *Provincial, National, and Oecumenical Synods and Councils*. And if the Laws of the Kingdom would bear it (haply) it would be as commodious (if not more) if a prime man or two in every Town had the power to meet and elect a Parliament man or two for the whole County.

"O but no such agreement hath been made (no not tacitely) Sect. 8.
"by the Church-Catholike, nor no such institution of Christ hath
"appeared yet."

Ans. We finde a pattern of a Synod in *Act. 15.* consisting
of delegated members, with formal disputes and decrees, not
of the Apostles only but the Elders also. And if one Church
may delegate and send to a Synod, then may another, yea,
twenty.

And we finde that the Churches did then submit unto
them, to their great profit, *Act. 15. 31.* And the Churches for-
merly have agreed unto, honoured, and submitted unto Coun-
cels, and received much good by them; especially the first and
general Council of Nice, &c. And indeed the choice and send-
ing of members to make up Synods, is more then a tacite agree-
ment to them, as well as the choice of Parliament men is a
verbal agreement, and promise of submission to the Parlia-
ment.

Object. But if the Ministers be Pastors to the whole Church, Sect. 8.
then the whole is to honour them, and contribute towards their
maintenance, because they serve the whole, ordinarily in their
own Congregations, and occasionally by preaching and ruling in
Classes and Synods, for it is due from them that are taught and
ruled. *Gal. 6. 6. 1 Tim. 5. 17.*

Ans. That all men are bound to honour all the Ministers
for their office and works sake, is true; though they cannot ac-
tually apply and give testimonies of that honour, but to such
as they know. But for maintenance, the people over whom the
Minister hath the particular inspection, and among whom he
doth assiduously labour, are ordinarily to afford it, being the
persons that actually partake of his continual labours, and it
is the most convenient way of certain and speedy raising of it, as
the Levites had maintenance from the several places where
they dwelt, both cities and gleads, and other comings in.
Micah giveth a stipend to *Jonathan the Levite*, his diet and
apparel, *Judg. 17. 10.* It is like the Elders of *Jerusalem* were
maintained by the Church of *Jerusalem*, but whether it was
collected in the particular meeting-houses for such as did la-
bour there particularly, or put into one stock for the mainte-

Chap. 7. nance of their whole Eldership, I know not.

But suppose one able man will maintain a Minister for the whole Congregation, or a Lecturer or Minister in another Congregation, or the State shall maintain a Minister in a Congregation, is that Congregation bound to afford him a second honourable maintenance? Or suppose a Combination of Ministers having sufficient maintenance from their several Congregations will joyn together, and maintain a Lecture freely, may not the people hear them, because they doe not maintain them? I fear you will finde but few Congregations will make that scruple.

Obj. But the Ministers perform not their whole office to the Congregation that maintains them, but part of it to the *Classis*, and part to the *Provincial* or *National* Churches, and part to the *Catholike Church*.

Ans. A particular Eldership perform their whole office to their own Congregation, which concerneth their Congregation only, as farre as they are able. But in some things the particular Congregation stands in need of the help of other Elders, as in male-administration, and matters of more weight; and there be matters of more general concernment then can be transacted in one single Eldership: and other Congregations likewise may stand in need of the help of their Eldership in the like cases: and so the particular Congregation is not hindered but helped by combination. And even in their greater Presbyteries they serve their own Congregations also, as well as in their own Congregations they serve the Church-Catholike, in admitting members in, and casting them out that are scandalous, and in feeding, nourishing, and governing the members thereof, in their own Congregations.

Ob. But this will be too great a burthen for Ministers to meddle in the affairs of many Congregations, who will have work enough in their own.

Ans. As they shall afford help to others, so they shall receive help for their own Congregation from others with whom they are combined. But what greater burthen will it be to doe it in an authoritative way, more then in a charitative? and

and yet that our brethren will allow.

Se^ct. 9.

Object. But then the Ministers exercise rule where they doe not ordinarily preach, and so the keys are not commensurable.

Ans. The keys are commensurable, though the exercise of them be not alwaies commensurable. Neither is a Minister bound alwaies to put forth the exercise of every key, where he puts forth one. A man may preach where he administred no Sacraments. *Paul* preached much at *Corinth*, but was not bound to baptize there: though no doubt he converted many, yet he baptized but few, *1 Cor.* 1. Christ himself preached much, but baptized not, *Joh.* 4. 2. *Peter* preached to *Cornelius* and his company, but baptized them not: it is said he commanded them to be baptized. And the Apostles usually carried about with them a Minister to baptize those whom they converted; as shall be shewed more in the second question.

A man may administer Sacraments where he preacheth not, as the Apostles baptized, but Christ only preached there. And he that baptized *Cornelius* and his company, did not preach unto them, but *Peter* only preached. We reade not that the *Minister*, which *Paul* and *Barnabas* carried about with them, did preach.

A Minister may both preach and administer Sacraments where he rules nor, As *Philip* to the *Eunuch*, The Apostles and the 70, in Christ's time: and Ministers that preach abroad in a journey, or at a Lecture.

Also a Minister may rule where he neither preacheth nor administred any Sacraments: for all the Elders in *Jerusalem* ruled in common; but preached and administred Sacraments from house to house, and could not preach to every Congregation whom they ruled. Also the Elders at *Jerusalem*, *Act.* 15. did exercise discipline in making decrees for *Antioch*, *Syria*, and *Cilicia*, where they preached not.

Object. This formerly was a grand Objection against the Bishops; that they undertook to rule where they preached not.

Se^ct. 9.

Ans. The exceptions against the Bishops, were first, That they or most of them arrogated that power of rule to themselves.

Chap. 7.

selves upon a wrong ground, *viz.* not as Presbyters, but as men of a superiour order and office, *viz.* of being Bishops, and so above Presbyters, even Pastors of Pastors. Secondly, They challenged that to be due to one that belonged to a College or Eldership, or combination of Elders. Thirdly, They rob'd the people and Pastors of their liberty and power: for they did not associate Congregations with them, but subdued them unto them. They were not mutually subject to Presbyteries, but made the Presbyteries subject to themselves. They did not carry things in way of consociation and confederacy *as inter Pares*, but as Lords both of Ministers and people. They took the whole Diocese to be their actual cure, and all Ministers were but their Curates. They forced men to bring in presentments to them and their delegates, which concerned the particular Congregations only, and ought and might have been transacted there. But it was not for exercising an act of discipline merely where they did not preach, but because it was not on a right ground, nor in a right way. See these things noted by the Assembly in their answer to the dissenting brethren. *pag. 11.*

Obj. If there be superiour and more general Assemblies, and appeals unto them, then great and stubborn persons will never be brought to censure, for they will appeal higher and higher, even to a general Council, which haply will not convene in their life time.

Ans. The Officers of the particular Congregation have power to inflict the censure, if they finde just cause, and that censure remaineth on them, notwithstanding their appeal, until their cause be heard in a greater Assembly, and if it then be found to be just, they confirm it, and leave it upon them, if unjust, they ought to relieve them.

Obj. If appeals be admitted to greater Assemblies, as Provincial, National, and much more Oecumenical Councils, it will occasion much trouble and charge to the partie grieved, and to the witnesses and prosecutours to go so far to bring their causes to trial. This Objection or to this purpose M. Ellis maketh, *vind.* *pag. 16.*

Ans. That may be prevented by stating the question in difference,

rence, and putting it *inter controversias juris*, and so it may be Sect. 10.
determined indefinitely: and the matter of fact may be pro-
ceeded in accordingly in the particular Congregation or Classis,
in application to the particular persons, *secundum allegata &*
probata.

Obj. But if appeals be admitted from the Congregational El-
dership, because they may erre, the same danger will lie against
Classes, Synods and Councils, for they may erre also, and by the
same reason a man may appeal from a general Council, for that
may erre.

Ans. The appealing from the particular Eldership to superi-
our assemblies, is not because they are infallible and cannot erre,
but because there is lesse danger of erring, and fewer temptations
to erre or be swayed; then in the particular Eldership. *In the*
multitude of Counsellors there is safety. Many eyes see more then
a few: and those greater Assemblies consist of more choice e-
minent persons usually, then the particular Elderships. And
they are freer from all suspicion of personal grudge or animosi-
ties, and not so subject to fear of revenge from the censured
person.

This liberty of appeals, as it is founded in the law of nature, Sect. 10.
and seen by the light thereof, and in use in all societies, and
granted to the Jewish Church, and practised by the Church of
Antioch in *Act. 15.* and in use anciently in the primitive times,
Providendum est ne innocens damnetur, ideo habeat potestatem
is qui abjectus est ut Episcopus finitimos interpellet, Conc. Sard.
Can. 17. &c. So also it is in effect granted by the Apologists
themselves, *Apol. Nar. p. 21.* "It is the most abhorred maxime
"that any religion hath ever made profession of, and therefore
"of all other the most contradictory and dishonourable unto
"that of Christianity, that a single and particular society of men
"professing the name of Christ, and pretending to be endow-
"ed with a power from Christ to judge them that are of the
"same body and society with themselves, should either arro-
"gate to themselves an exemption from giving an account, or
"being censurable to any other, either Christian Magistrate a-
"bove them, or neighbour Churches about them. But what
kind of account or censurableness they mean, I know not.
But

Chap. 7. But as the censurableness from the Christian Magistrate above them must be meant of a judicial censure in his kinde, which is civil; so that from the neighbour-Churches about them should be judicial also in their kinde, which is Ecclesiastical.

Obje. But if general Councils be an Ordinance of God, and the supream Ecclesiastical judicatory, it is a marvel that Christ should suffer his Church to be so many hundred years without it; it should then rather be a constant, standing Court.

Ans. It is not necessary that there should be a standing Court Catholike consisting of constant Officers of the Church-Catholike actually, as there is of particular Churches, but only occasionally *pro re nata*: for there is power put into particular Churches for the managing their own affairs; and such affairs as are of general concernment, and of greater weight then can be transacted in a particular Eldership, or Classis, or Provincial, or National Assembly, fall out very seldom. The Apostles themselves after their dispersion kept no such general standing Court, much lesse is it needful now. *Cogi Optimates non semper est necesse*, Chamier tom. 2. lib. 10. cap. 8. sect. 15, 16. where he answers this objection fully. A general Council ought to be (saith *Salmas.*) only, *Quoties exigit causa communis*, &c. Appar. 273. It is not *ad esse Ecclesia*, *neq. ad bene esse Ecclesia*, sed *ad optimum esse Ecclesia*, saith M. Rutherford. The Church of Antioch had once an occasion of appeal to a Synod at Jerusalem, but no such cause of constant recourse thither. This Objection may be made as well about the Christian Magistrate; seeing he is to be a nursing father to the Church, and such were promised by God, it may be marvelled that God should let the Evangelical Church want them in the infancy of it for above 300. years; and many of the Emperours after they proved Christians were wasters of the Church and promoters of Arianism and Popery, and not nourishers of the Church. But we must not undertake to prescribe God what is best. *Times and seasons are in his hand.*

Obj. If general Councils be the supream Ecclesiastical Judicatories, then how dare any particular Churches, at most but (if)

National.

National, abrogate and swear against the Ordinances and government established by the Catholike Church. And this Objection he bids me minde, *vin. p. 56.* I suppose he meant the Objection, in reference to the National Oath and Covenant against Arch-bishops, Bishops, &c.

Ans. Although Councils are very reverend and to be submitted unto in the Lord, yet are they not infallible, but may erre; they are not *regularis*, but *regulata & regulanda*, and to be tried by the word of God, and if they speak not according to that, they are not to be obeyed. *Clavis errans non ligat.* Yet it is safer to be guided by a multitude of Counsellors in a great, yea, general Assembly, if it were rightly gathered (which the Popish Councils were not) then to stand bound by two or three Elders in a particular Congregation without relief.

The doctrine of that famous Council of *Nice*, and some others following, was sound, and we have not departed from them therein. And we know, that although many Councils were corrupt and not rightly chosen, nor acting uprightly according to the word, but guided by factions, and swayed by the Pope, and the best not infallible, yet the Scriptures are a constant, infallible rule to walk by. *Nec ego Nicenam Synodum tibi, nec tu mihi Ariminensem debes, tanquam prejudicatorum, obicere. Nec ego hujus autoritate, nec tu illius detineris.* August. advers. Maximin. lib. 3.

A 2

CHAP.

Chap. 8.

CHAP. VIII.

An answer to M. Ellis's Prejudices, Probabilities and Demonstrations against an universal visible (and as he calls it) governing (but should have said Organical) Church. And his wrong stating of the question rectified.

MR. Ellis hath set down divers just prejudices (as he calls them) and strong probabilities (vind. chap. 3. pag. 10.) and Demonstrations (vind. ch. 4. p. 19.) against this position, or rather against an opinion of his own stating and framing, for I know none that own it as he hath stated it. But it is an easy thing to set up a man of straw, and then beat it down at pleasure.

SECT. I.

Before I answer these prejudices, probabilities and demonstrations, it will be requisite to view what M. Ellis denyeth, and what he granteth, and how he stateth the question, and what is the true state of it, and wherein the difference lyeth between him and his opponents, and then we shall the better see how his prejudices, probabilities and demonstrations will lie against the question in hand.

"First, he denyeth the question to be meant of the essential
"oneness of the Church, whereby all the Christians in the
"world *divisim*, and in their several places doe visibly, out-
"wardly, and openly profess (for substance) the same faith,
"seals, worship and government, and so may be said to be one
"company, one society, one Congregation in nature and essence.
vind. p. 7.

But indeed this oneness is included in the question, and is the very foundation and ground of all: we desire no other unity then will necessarily flow from this. This Entitive visible unity of the whole as one society under one head, in one visible Covenant, under the same seal, under the same laws from the same authority, is enough to denominate a Church-Catholike visible,

visible, and one visible kingdom of Christ here on earth. And Sect. 1. to this Church as one integral society, were the Ordinances and priviledges primarily given, and for their enjoyment thereof was the organical and politicalness added, and it was made one habitual, organical, visible Kingdom of Christ on earth, because all these visible subjects have one common right to, and communion in the same Ordinances and priviledges indefinitely in this whole visible kingdom.

But I fear this will not sate our brethren who make not the general Covenant, which giveth the essence and entitiveness to the Church, but the particular Covenant, compact and confederation to give the right to the Ordinances. Their tenet (as far as I can collect from their books) is, that a company of visible beleevers being joyned together in a particular holy Covenant, have thereby right to the enjoyment of all Gods Ordinances; and hence flow their right of choosing and ordaining Officers over themselves (the Ordination in their sense being nothing else (as I conceive) but a designation or assignation of those chosen men) by the imposition of hands (of some men appointed by them in their name and behalf) to be their particular Officers, to dispense the Ordinances of Jesus Christ unto them. And hence also floweth their right of censuring and ejecting those Officers again, if they miscarry themselves. *Ejusdem est instituire & destituere*, and if the Congregation can appoint men to lay hands on their Officers in their behalf, and let them up, then also if they see cause they can appoint men to lay hands on them by censures, and pluck them down again, or else they must go out of their Congregation to neighbour Elders for that censure, which is contrary to their own tenet, if it be an Ordinance of God. Yea, they must go out of their Congregation for discipline, which is most contrary to their principles, and that indeed where the greatest pinch lyeth, for they do not so much startle at a Ministers dispensing the word or Sacraments to other Congregations, for that is done frequently by them, or at the exercise of the key of discipline; and as I conceive, that it is that which breedeth this difference between us. And if they must go out of their Congregation for the censure of their Elders, why not by the same reason in some cases

Chap. 8.

for the censure of some private members? So that by their tenet their right to Gods Ordinances neither ariseth from their being in the general Covenant, for so they were before their confederation, nor yet from their organicalness, for they have power to organize themselves, and disannul those Organs again, and to perform some Church-acts before and without Organs, but it ariseth meerly from their particular covenant and confederation.

"2. Neither is the Query (saith he) whether the several companies or Churches of this profession as they are one in nature so also in spirit and affection, and thereupon in engagement of mutual care one of another, and to take notice what doctines are dispersed, what conversation used among the Churches pag. 7.

If by Engagement he meaneth an amicitial or fraternal Engagement, as he seems by his paralleling it with the Engagement of brethren of the same family, indeed it cometh not up to the question in hand; but if he meaneth an Engagement not only founded upon similarity of nature and unity of Spirit and affection, but upon an expresse command of Christ to his subjects in their places and Offices, to uphold his honour, and purity of his Ordinances, and watch over their fellow-subjects to keep them from prophaneſſe and error, or cure them if they be fallen thereinto, and this not by advice and perswasion, but by Ecclesiastical censures, if they be stubborn and obstinate, then it comes up to the question in hand. And surely the case may be so, that the key of doctrine will not serve, but the key of discipline (which our brethren acknowledge is commensurable with it) must be exerted also. Stroakings and lenitives will not cure all maladies in the natural body, nor good counsel all the distempers in the Common-wealth, nor yet in the Church, there must sometimes be corrosives of censures applied.

"Nor 3. is it doubtful (saith he) whether such Churches may voluntarily, as occasion shall require, associate together for mutual assistance, and act (in many things) by common hand and joint consent, &c. This the Scripture and light of nature dictates.

If by voluntary he doth not mean arbitrary, but such a voluntary and yet necessary obedience to the dictates of Scripture and

and the light of nature as is in the observation of Gods commands, and as the voluntary joyning of members to a particular Congregation, then it is the very ground of Synodical Assemblies. And though it be but occasional, yet these occasions falling out frequently and constantly, so ought those meetings to be as frequent and constant, which is all the Presbyterians contend for. And the same Scripture and light of nature that dictates this voluntary, occasional meeting, dictates also that they should have power to act together when they are met, else to what purpose should they meet? no occasion can warrant them to do that which God hath not given them power to do. And whereas he saith the testimonies alledged by Crankenthop. in *Def. Eccl. Ang.* cap 28. are meant of an obligation of charity and not of office, it is utterly mistaken, for they speak of their power as Bishops, *Cura omnium obitum, quia Episcopi sunt, ad omnes spectat.* And *Episcopi omnes, quia Episcopi, non versalis Ecclesia pastores sunt, & jure Divino sic pastores sunt.*

"Nor 4. (saith he) is it the scruple, Whether all or most of the Churches in the world may not possibly become occasionally one by their messengers in a general Council. But as I conceive this is the highest thing that the Presbyterians aim at in such a Council, and is the thing which himself makes question of, *vind.* pag. 8. lin 1. and yet four lines further seems to yield it again.

Then M. Ellis *vind* p. 8. comes to state the power of associated Churches, whether lesse or more, and especially a general Council. And there he grants an authoritative power (at least virtual) from Christ to act, and give not only advice, but directions and rules, to which the conscience is bound to submit, unless special cause dissuade us. And this authority is more august and solemn (though not greater) the greater the number is, and the more publike the manner of giving forth the precepts shall be. And (a little further he saith) in doubtful cases, or upon occasion of grosser errors and scandals, God hath by Ordinance (virtual) appointed recourse to others, especially Churches, whose prescriptions, not disagreeing from the Word, are to be obeyed, not only because they are materially good, but formally theirs.

Chap. 8.

Here he granteth almost as much as the Presbyterians doe desire, yet plucks it away again in the very next words in say-
 "ing That their acting in giving such directions and rules, is the
 "acting of Officers, but not as Officers, for such they are only
 "in their severall Churches, but yet by reason of that relation
 "they are the more fit for that work, &c. But hereby he o-
 verthroweth the analogy of their acting with the acting of an
 assembly of Lawyers or Judges, or a College of Physicians con-
 vened by publike consent, which he there makes the parallel
 of this Ecclesiastical acting, for their acting *conjunctim* is by
 vertue of their office and professions respectively, as much as
divisim, and not meerly as friends or men skilled in those sub-
 jects and sciences; for it (by their office and profession) be-
 cometh (as he confesseth) authoritative, and to be submitted
 unto, not only because materially good but formally theirs, who
 by office and profession have power and authority to give it.
 If he would have made his parallel to run to his minde, he
 should have resembled the actings in Conneells to the advice
 of understanding friends and neighbours in matters of Law
 and Physick, who have no office therein, or profession thereof,
 but have some knowledge and experience therein, and thereby
 are fit to give friendly and neighbourly, charitative advice and
 directions. How men can have authority to make rules which
 are to be obeyed because they are formally their rules, and yet
 do this as men without office, I understand not. The Synod
 of 1545 did make decrees, and give commands, he confesseth,
 but did not impose any penality: but surely the making decrees
 and commands implied an authority, and that *conjunctim* so
 to do, and the imposing of them implied a power of office,
 and that a coercive also, else decrees and commands are to lit-
 tle purpose.

And to passe by his second grant, what power the Church-
 Catholike may possibly have in unusual and extraordinary cases
 or accidents, I come to his third grant, viz. "what power the
 "universal visible Church might have, (if possibly conveyable)
 "together, as it was at Jerusalem (in which case (saith he) we
 "grant what is contended for) but the Query is, What pow-
 "er the parts have asunder, and without endeavouring the
 "joyning

“joyning with the other: For even in a Kingdom, though Sect. 2.
 “all the Corporations gathered in one, have power over all
 “particulars: yet not some of these, much lesse a few of them
 “asunder; which is the way our brethren now practise; *vind.*
pag. 9.

Here he granteth what is contended for, if the whole were
 convenable, &c. (as I conceive) all the Officers of the whole
 Church. But if that could be, I doubt he holds they must, either
 act as men out of office, or as particular Officers, every one in
 reference to his particular Congregation: or can their conven-
 tion together put a general office upon them which they had
 not before? or draw forth general actions that concern the
 whole, from them that had no habitual power reaching the
 whole? but if all the Officers met together can rule the whole,
 because every particular Congregation hath its Officer there,
 why hath not a part thereof convened, power to rule that
 part also? seeing the right and reason is the same, seeing the
 Church is a similar body in regard of the integrals, and the
 parts are similar parts. And if so, here will be an unavoidable
 ground for classical associations, where all the Officers may
 meet. “And himself freely acknowledgeth the conveniency and
 “necessity of Classes, yea, and Synods also, for direction and
 “determination, and that by divine right, though not with
 “power properly juridical. *vind. pag. 3.* But then their directi-
 “ons and determinations must be by his opinion, but chari-
 “tative, and by their skill only, and not by vertue of their
 “office.

But the reason why his parallel of a Kingdom, where a
 part cannot make laws for that part, holdeth not, is because
 the whole Kingdom is under one legislative power, and com-
 bined together in a body representative under one head, who
 hath power to make uniform laws for the whole, but neither the
 Church-Catholike nor any particular Church can make any new
 divine laws, or abrogate any of them which Christ hath set down,
 but explain them, and make particular rules according to the ge-
 neral, and nor otherwise; and put Christs laws in execution:
 and this a particular combination may do in their sphere, for
 their limits. And so as farre as their Commissions reach, the Of-
 ficers

Chap. 8. Officers in a Corporation may make constitutions for the Corporation, so they be not contrary to their charter; and the Justices or Committees for a County may make Orders for the County, so they be agreeable to the Laws of the Land, whereof the County is a part: and have habitual power to execute justice in any part of the County, as occasion serveth, though they, for conveniency sake, do usually act in their several divisions.

A Justice or Mayor or Constable cannot act beyond their County, Corporation, or Town, though they be desired and called, without a new Commission, but a Minister may preach and administer Sacraments in any part of the Church-Catholike upon a call, and why not also act judicially and juridically any where (according to the foresaid limitation) if he hath a call to bring his habitual power into act, seeing the keys are commendable?

Señ. 3.

But then he comes to state the question positively what it is. And he sets it down thus, viz. "Whether the whole company of Christians on earth are in their ordinary and settled Church-constitution, so one intire single Common-wealth, Corporation and Congregation, as that of right, and by the will and appointment of Jesus Christ it is the first subject of all Church-power: by authority whereof, and commission from which, all particular Churches act, and to the determinations of the major part whereof they are to yield obedience (if not apparently contrary to the word of God) and the Catholike governing power whereof, resides immediatly as in its proper subject under Christ, only in the Ministers and Elders; and they not taken severally, but jointly as one entire College or Presbytery: to whose charge severally and jointly the whole and every particular Church is committed, &c."

And this assertion M. E. sets down with (") in the margin, and cites *Apollonius* and the *London-Ministers* as the Authors of it, as if they were their very words: but they are neither their words nor sense. I wonder, Sir, who ever dreamed of such an assertion, but your self. It is not honest dealing to lay the births of your own brains at other mens doors, to make them father them.

The like stating of it is again, *vind.* pag. 40. where the same Sect. 3. Authours are cited, *viz.* Apollon. cap. 3. sect. 4. And *3rd Divinum* pag. 43. and pag. 163. And again, *vind.* p. 27. and there are cited for it, Apollon. cap. 3. pag. 41. And *Hudson* p. 25. as assertors of this opinion *expressly*. But I am sure there is no such thing asserted by these Authours in any of those places. And if he saith it is drawn by consequence from their tenets, I answer, it is not accounted fair dealing to affirm those consequences that may be drawn from any mans opinion, to be his opinion, when (haply) he was never aware of any such consequences, or doth deny the consequence of them from his opinion. Much lesse is it fair to set them down in capital letters, and with marks in the margin, which usually importeth them to be their very words: or to make that the main controversie which is not owned by the opposite partee, but (haply) may be drawn by consequence.

The scope of *Apollonius* and the *London-Ministers* is to set down the proper subject and receptacle of the keys, first, negatively, not the people or *causa fidelium*, nor the civil Magistrate (though they grant him a defensive, diatactick, compulsive, cumulative power, a power *circa sacra, non in sacris*) nor Papal Officers, as Cardinals, &c. nor prelatial, as Deans, Arch-Deacons, &c. nor political Officers, as Committees, Commissioners, nor Deacons. But positively all those Church-guides, extraordinary and ordinary, which Christ hath erected in his Church, vesting them with power and authority therein, *viz.* Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastours and Teachers, governments or ruling-Elders, these Christ hath made the immediate receptacle, and first subject of the keys, or of Ecclesiastical power from himself. So say the London-Ministers *expressly*.

Now suppose they had undertaken to set down who were the proper subject of civil authority under the King: and should first negatively say, it is not the Physician, nor the Chirurgeon, nor the Mathematician, nor the Merchants, nor Mariners, nor Tradesmen, nor Husbandmen, and Farmers, but positively they are the Judges, Sheriffs, Justices, Mayors, Bayliffs, and Constables: Would any one gather from hence that all these Officers, not taken se-

Chap. 8.

verally but jointly, are one entire, actual college of Officers, to whose charge severally and jointly the whole, and every part of the Kingdom is committed; by authority whereof, and dependance upon which common Officers, the Officers of every particular Town do act?

Besides, this stating of the question is not consistent with itself, for it makes the Church-Catholike the first subject of all Church-power, and then makes the Ministers and Elders the proper subject thereof: but the proper subject is the prime subject. Unless he means in a logical sense; as sight is predicated of the whole man, and yet is seated properly in the eye: or reason is given to the whole man, and yet is seated in the understanding. Christ hath given all his Ordinances to his visible Church: for the publike dispensation of which he hath instituted Church-Officers, to whom he hath committed that power respectively: these officers are distributed among, and settled in their severall Congregations, and there actually and constantly dispense these Ordinances to them, as by their office they are enabled, according to the word; and yet because there are some things of common concernment with other Congregations, and of greater moment and difficulty then can be transacted by a few Elders in a particular Congregation, therefore upon such occasions they may act *conjunctim*, with the Elders of other Congregations; and may also dispense both Word and seals occasionally to other Congregations, upon a call by opportunity, want, or desire of other Congregations.

Yet do not the Presbyterians hold, that the particular Churches or Officers act by authority of, and commission from the one entire, single Common-wealth, Corporation and Congregation of the whole company of Christians on earth, as M. Ellis is pleased to set it down, to render their tenets odious: but they hold that every Minister by vertue of his office hath an immediate, habitual power from Christ to dispense his Ordinances, but the constant exerting and exercise of this power is called forth into act by that parcel of the Church-Catholike, which hath given him a call to take the particular immediate inspection and care over them in the Lord, yet upon occasion for the honour of God, the vindicating of his truth, the suppress-

ling

ing of more general errors and scandals, the propagating of Sect. 3.
the Gospel, and the good of others as God gives opportunity,
it may be exerted and exercised in other places, and to other
persons, so confusion and disorder be avoided.

Neither do the National Churches act by commission from
the Catholike, nor the Provincial from the National, nor the
Classis from the Provincial, nor the Congregational from the
Classis; but every Minister acts by commission from Jesus Christ,
by vertue of his Office. And the Congregational Eldership is
first in acting, though last in Christs intention, in instituting the
office. Every drop of water is similar to the whole element, and
is cold and moist, but receives not those qualities from the whole
Element, but hath them immediately in its self, and though it
actually exerts them only where it is placed and applied, yet
hath an habitual power to exert them any where else, if appli-
ed: So the Church-Officers have their power, neither from the
Church Catholike nor from their particular Congregation, but
from their office, which they receive from Christ (though ministe-
rially admitted thereto by the Presbytery) which power though
ordinarily and constantly they exert in their own Congregation,
yet can elsewhere upon a call.

Neither do the Presbyterians say, that the Church Catholike
or the whole company of Christians on earth, are in their or-
dinary and settled Church-constitution one entire, single Com-
mon-wealth, Corporation and Congregation actually, but one
habitual Common-wealth and Corporation, made up by the ag-
gregation of all the single, actual Congregations of Christians
in the world (as an Empire of all the Provinces and Kingdoms
under it) and that beside the particular, actual, constant affairs
of the Congregations, which are properly to be managed by
such as are the particular actual Officers thereof, there are
some things that concern more then themselves, and those are
to be transacted (as such occasions arise) by the Officers of so
many Congregations as they concern, they belonging properly
to the cognizance of Officers, as Officers: and if those matters
be of more general concernment, then that all the Officers
concerned therein can meet, without confusion, to transact
them, then they are to delegate some choice Officers from the

Chap. 8.

several vicinities to transact them, as hath been shewed before: and as the call of the Congregation draweth forth the power of the Officers to act among them constantly, so this delegation calls forth their power to act occasionally *pro tempore* in this greater meeting. The case was once that *Totus mundus ingemuit sub Arianismo*: this concerned the whole, or the greater part, and could not be cured by particular Officers, as particular, in their several Congregations *divisim*, and therefore required a more general meeting of Officers (to whom by reason of their office it did appertain) to consider of it, and suppress it *conjunctim*, by confutations and censures: and these having done the work they were called forth unto, then are to return to their particular charges again: for this work is but occasional, and these occasions fall out very rarely. This makes not the whole Church-Catholike under one actual constant regiment.

Yet because in Churches that are near together in a vicinity, matters of common concernment or that require the help of more Elders than one or two Congregations can afford, will frequently and constantly occur, and if there be not a set time and place appointed by consent for a certain number of Officers of that vicinity to meet, they will be drawn together with much difficulty, charge, labour, trouble and confusion, and with little certainty (as appears by the case of M. Ward in the Netherlands, who being unjustly cast out of his place, could not under two years get a meeting of neighbour-Elders to hear and right his cause, and when he had obtained a meeting, it was but of very few, *viz.* the Elders of *Arnhem*, as I have been informed) therefore it is conceived that there should be a certain time and place appointed for the Elders of such a vicinity as are in combination for mutual assistance, to meet in.

M. Ellis mistakes the state of the question, in saying the Ministers and Elders of the Catholike Church not taken severally but jointly, as one entire College or Presbytery, have the charge severally and jointly of the whole, and every particular Church committed to them, *vind.* pag. 9. For they are not actually Ministers and Elders of the Church-Catholike,

The stating of the Question revised.

nor actually one entire College and Presbytery, nor have not a Sect. 3.
actually the charge of the whole and every particular Church, but
habitually only, by reason of the indefiniteness of their office;
They have power *in actu primo* by vertue of their office, but not
in actu secundo sive exercito: they have *in ad rem* every where,
but not *in re* any where without a call. They are the Ministers
of Jesus Christ, and thereby have right and power to perform
the acts belonging to their office, but for the execution of it,
either in a particular Church constantly, or *conjunctim* occasi-
onally with others, there is required a call thereunto. And the
not observing of this distinction is the cause of this difference
in this question. The Levites were by their office consecrated
to do the service of the Tabernacle, and to stand before the Con-
gregation to minister unto them, Numb. 16.9. And the Priests to
offer sacrifice: and both Priests and Levites were to be Teach-
ers and Judges and Israel: and they had 48. Cities with their
suburbs given unto them: but they might not at their pleasure
exercise this power, and dwell where they listed, and minister
in what they pleased, or offer sacrifice promiscuously when they
listed, or be Teachers and Judges where and when they listed,
but according to appointment and assignation, and according
to their courses, and as they had a call to exert their power.
So it is with the Ministers of the Gospel, They are vested with an
office to dispense Gods Ordinances of worship and discipline,
but they may not execute this office, but as they have an espe-
cial call thereunto, no more then require maintenance, which
also belongs to their office, except from those that call them
to exercise their office among them. There are houses and
glebes and maintenance allotted by the law of the land for the
Ministry, but every Minister may not carve for himself where
and what he pleaseth. The particular exerting of the office and
reception of maintenance in and from particular Congregations
is not *qua* Minister indefinitely and habitually, but *qua* Roma-
nus, *Alexandrinus*, *Londonensis*, *Gipponiensis*. The whole Church
in reference to Christ the King thereof, is indeed an actual po-
litie, but in reference to the ordinary Officers, whose office
though habitually it be indefinite, yet is actually drawn forth
into exercise by a particular or special call and evocation; it
may

Chap. 8.
Sect. 4.

may be stiled an habitual polity.

Now let us see how M. *Elu's* Prejudices, Probabilities, and Demonstrations will lie against this habitual integrality of the Church-Catholike visible, and against the habitual indefiniteness of the Ministers office.

First, he objecteth the *novelty* of this opinion. And indeed well he may, as he hath stated it, for he was the first that hatch-ed it in his own brains. But that the Church is one habitually, and that the particular Churches bear the relation of members to the whole, and of fellow-members one to another, and that Ministers are Ministers beyond the limits of their particular Congregations, and can upon occasion administer the Ordinances of God to more persons then those of their own Congregation authoritatively (upon which hinge hangeth the whole question) this is no novel opinion.

For the first execution of the Evangelical, Ministerial office, in teaching and baptizing by John Baptist, and by the Apostles before they had their general commission, and the preaching of the *yo.* was without any respect to any particular Congregations, for there were none set up. And when they were set up, the Apostles send faithful teachers to the several Churches whom they commended also to them, exhorting them to receive, respect, and obey them; as *Timothy* and *Apollus*, 1 Cor. 16. 10, 11, 12. *Phil.* 2. 19, 23. And the many places whether *Timothy* and *Titus* travelled, and where they preached and exercised their office, is abundantly set down in the Scriptures, and gathered out by *Smoltymannus*, and M. *Prinne* in his unbishoping of *Timothy* and *Titus*.

The Apostle also sent *Tychicus* a faithful Minister to the *Ephesians*, Eph. 6. 21. and under the same notion of a faithful Minister he sends him also to the *Colossians*, Col. 7. 8. as is further noted in the second question. And lest this should be said to be done as he was an Evangelist (though we finde him not expressly called an Evangelist) yet it is clear that there were many that preached the Gospel in the Apostles daies in more places then one authoritatively. The brethren that *John* writes of in his 3^d Epist. went forth and were helpers to the truth, taking nothing of the Gentiles, were Ministers which might have

have taken maintenance, but did not, that they might spread Sect. 4.
the Gospel. It appears also even by the false Teachers that
crept into *Galatia* and *Corinthia* *Paul's* absence: and those that
went from *Jerusalem* to *Antioch* and bred the broil there, and
those that preached the Gospel of envy and strife, *Phil.* 2. 15.
who certainly were no Evangelists, neither do I allow of their
false doctrine, yet it proveth that it was ordinary for Ministers
to preach to more Congregations then one. And it is very pro-
bable that those dispersed which went up and down preaching,
Acts 8. 4. were officers, as one hath lately shewed, for what
should the Apostles doe at *Jerusalem* if there were no private
Christians there? and it is likely that the heat of the persecution
fell most upon the officers, and therefore they were generally
scattered abroad, except the Apostles.

And in the after ages of the Church there was nothing more
frequent, then for Ministers to act out of their own Congre-
gations. We finde indeed provision made by *Canons* for the
ordaining of Ministers in the exercise of their function in other
places then their own, but no prohibition to exclude them
from it. As first, that they must have leave to do what they did:
which was a wise provision against such as crept into other
Churches without a call. It was provided in *Conc. Nic. Can. 17.*
Caranza. That no Bishop should ordain any that belonged to an-
other Bishop, *Com non habeat consensum Episcopi ipsius a quo*
recassitolerium. And *Conc. Constantinop. Can. 21. secundum Zeno-*
ram. ἀλλήτοις δὲ ἐπισκοποισι τὸν ἐπισκοπικὸν ἀμβλυσεν, &c. *Non vo-*
catis Episcopi ultra Diocesim ne transiant ad ordinationem vel
aliquam aliam administrationem Ecclesiasticam. There is not
taken away from them power of exercising of any of these
things in other Dioceses, when they were called by others to
help therein. *Nullus Episcopus ex alia provincia audeat ad aliam*
transgredi, & ad promotionem ministerij aliquas in Ecclesijs or-
dinare, nisi fuerit rogatus adveniat. *Conc. Antioch. Can. 13.*
Caranz. *Nisi forte cum consilio & voluntate regionis Episcopi.*
Can. 22. Yes, the Council of *Sardis* provideth, that if a Bishop
in a Province where there have been more Bishops, did neglect
to ordain more Bishops, then might the Bishops of the neigh-
bouring Province (being desired by the people of that Pro-
vince)

vince) come ex vicina provincia & ordinans Episcopum. Conc. Sard. Can. 2. secund. Isidor. *sed* Can. 9. secund. Caranz.

Secondly, No Bishop ought to sollicite an Ecclesiastical Officer of another Diocese into his own, and ordain him there. Conc. Sardic. Can. 18. *Caranz.*

Thirdly, When Presbyters travelled abroad they could not be admitted to officiate *ἀνεῖς συγκαθ' ὁρμημάτων τῶν ἐκείνων ἐπισκόπων μὴδ' ὅλως μὴδ' ἐν ἀποστολῇ. Absque literis commendatitijs proprijs Episcopi nusquam alio modo ministrare.* Conc. Chalced. Can. 13. *secundum Zonarium* 12. *sec.* Caranz. Then if they came commended by their bishop they might perform any Ecclesiastical duty. *Vide Concilij septimi canon, 10. apud Zonaram.*

Fourthly, They were not permitted to stay too long abroad. *Non multo tempore in aliena civitate residere. Definire ergo tempus, quia & non recipi Episcopum inhumanum est, & si diutius residet perniciosum est.* Conc. Sard. Can. 14. *Car.* *Per multa tempora nititur immorari.* Con. Antioch. Can. 3.

Fifthly, When they were abroad if they were recalled they were to return to their own charge, Conc. Antioch. Can. 3. Many other provisions were made, directing how Ministers were to carry themselves when they were abroad, but none of those provisions cut them off from officiating abroad, only they regulate them in their carriage to prevent disorders.

Many examples antiquity affords us of the dispensing of Ordinances of worship, ordination and discipline, beyond the limits of the Ministers own particular charge.

Pantenus of Alexandria was famous this way, *Tantum studij in Scriptura propaganda posuisse ferunt, ut praconem Evangelij Gentibus Orientalibus, & India sese conferret, κήρυξ τῆς εὐαγγελίας πρὸς τοὺς ἀνατολικοὺς. ὅστις ἀναδεδιήκει μέχρι τῆς Ἰνδίας ἐπιδάμνον γῆς.* It is said also, that there were many Evangelists, and faithful messengers prepared to promote and plant the heavenly word after the guise of the Apostles, *ἀποστολῶν μιμήματα.* Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 9, 10.

Ancient Bishop of Rome granted leave to *Polycarpus Bishop of Smyrna* for the reverence that he owed him, to administer the Lords Supper in his Church. *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρεχόμενον ὁ Ανίκτορος τὸν ἐυχόμενον τὸν πρεσβύτερον καὶ ἀποστολὴν διδόνον.* Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 24.

cap. 14. So *Nicephorus* relates, l. 4. cap. 39. And the *Centurists*, Sect. 4. Century 2. cap. 10.

Anicetus, *Pius*, *Hyginus*, *Telphorus*, and *Xystus* Bishops of *Rome*, gave the Eucharist to the Bishops of other Churches that resorted to them, though differing from them about Easter. *Enseb. ibid.*

Athanasius consecrated *Frumentius* Bishop at *Alexandria*, and sent him into *India*, and there he converted many to the faith, and builded many Churches. *Socrates lib. 1. cap. 15.*

Athanasius travelling from *Jerusalem* by *Pelensium* the ready way to *Alexandria*, preached in every city where he came, and exhorted them to eschew the Arians: and in divers of the Churches he ordained Ministers, though it were in other Bishops Provinces, ἢ πρὸς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ ὁποῖα ἐπὶ αὐτῷ. *Socr. lib. 2. cap. 19. 24.*

Basil Bishop of *Casarea* in *Cappadocia* fearing that the Doctrine of *Arius* would creep into the Provinces of *Pontus*, went into those parts and instructed men in his doctrine, καὶ πολλοὺς τοὺς ἀδελφεοὺς αὐτοῦ διδασκαλίας, τοὺς σαλευομένους ἐπέσχε, and confirmed the wavering. *Socrat. l. 4. c. 23, 25.*

Gregory Bishop of *Naxianum* did the like in many cities, and often went to *Constantinople* for that end, *Ibid.*

Paulus Bishop of *Emisa* came to *Alexandria* in the daies of *Cyril* Bishop there, and there he preached a famous Sermon. And *Cyril* writes of him in an Epistle to *John* Bishop of *Antioch*, that he laboured there in preaching beyond his strength, that he might overcome the envy of the devil, and joyn together in love the scattered members, καὶ τὸ μετὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν πολλῶν ἀποστολῶν καὶ οἰκονομίας τὰς πρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ πρὸς ὑμῶν ἐκκλησίας. *Evagr. lib. 1. cap. 6.*

Epiphanius Bish. of *Cyprus* came to *Constantinople* where *John Chrysostome* was Bishop, and in a Church not far from the wall of the City, he celebrated the communion, and made a Deacon without the leave of *Chrysostome*. And though *Chrysostome* reproves him for it, yet only for the breach of an Ecclesiastical canon. *Multa contra canones agit Epiphanius, primum, quod ministras Ecclesia ordinat in Ecclesia que sunt in meâ Diocesi. Soc. l. 1. c. 13.*

Chap. 8.

Moses a Saracen by birth, an eminent man, being much desired by *Mavia* the Queen of the *Saracens* to be their Bishop, was sent to *Alexandria* to be ordained: and though he refused to be ordained by *Lucius* the Arian Bishop, yet certain exiled Bishops ordained him in a mountain. *Socrat.* l. 4. c. 29. *Theodorus*, l. 4. c. 21.

Origen being sent for by the Churches of *Achaia*, as he was upon his journey to *Athens*, he went through *Palestina*, and was ordained to be a Presbyter by *Alexander* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and *Theodotus* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, though he was a man of *Alexandria*, and went to officiate in *Achaia*. *Histor. Magd.* Gen. 3. c. 10. cited also by *M. Par. Symson* History of the Church. pag. 268.

Yea, the dividing of Dioceses (and the same we may say of Parishes which are the bounds of particular Congregations) was but an humane prudential act. And therefore in the Council of *Nice*, they pleaded no higher ground for it but *Mos antiquus obtinuit*, &c. And in the Council of *Constantinople* consisting of 250. Bishops it was forbidden by canon that Bishops should leave their own Diocese, and intermeddle with forreign Churches, for until that time by reason of the great heat and storm of persecution it was *ad usque* indifferently used. *Socrat.* lib. 5. cap 8.

And what frequent use the Church anciently made of Synods and Councils, and how authoritatively they acted, *M. Ellis* cannot be ignorant: whole Volumes might be written of this subject. And therefore Reverend *M. Cotton* in *Keys*, chap. 6. handling the Question, Whether a Synod hath power of Ordination and excommunication, though his judgement seemeth to incline to the negative, yet saith, we will not take upon us hastily, to censure the many notable precedents of ancient and later Synods, who have put forth acts of power in both these kinds. Therefore of all arguments this of novelty might well have been spared, and may most justly be retorted upon the contrary opinion.

Five needless frivolous answers *M. Ellis* giveth against the antiquity of Synods.

1. That this joint handling of things of common concern-

MENT

ment doth not conclude them one Corporation, no more then Sect. 4.
the common Treaties of Nations in things of joint concernment. *vind.* p. 10. But this common concernment arose from the unity of the head, body, charter and Laws, and the mutual relation of members, and therefore that parallel holdeth not.

2. Saith he, this (it is certain) was at some distance of time, after the discipline of the Churches were corrupt and declined to worldly policy. *vind.* p. 11.

Ans. Surely this is not so of all. For the first convention, *Act.* 1. about the installing of a new Apostle, and that before the Church was divided into particular Churches, and for a thing that concerned the whole Church, a meeting which our Divines usually account a Synod, yea, a general Council, though not in all formalities, where there was a joint exercise of the key of order: this I say was before the corruption of discipline, or declining to worldly policy. And that Synod *Act.* 15. where decrees were made and imposed on the Churches, and that by Elders of divers Churches as well as Apostles, and concerning things indifferent in their own nature (some of them) though necessary in regard of that present time: that Synod was not lyable to this exception. Nor those two Synods in *Asia* where *John* the Apostle sat President, mentioned by *M. Patrick Symson* in his first *Century of Councils*, pag. 482. out of *Euseb.* lib. 3. cap. 20. mentioned also by the *Magdeburg. Centurists*.

3. It might be (saith he) by decree and judgement only, not by actual execution. Or

4. Each Church might act its own power, though in union with others, as so many severall and distinct Churches united, and Elders congregated, and so they might excommunicate from their own heap or Congregation only.

Ans. The history of the Councils doth abundantly confute this, for they acted as one body jointly for all the Churches they met for, and not severally, and did both ordain Bishops, and also actually excommunicate many hereticks. For what severall distinct Churches did the convention *Act.* 1. 20. seeing there were none then in being?

Chap. 8.

5. It was (saith he) a voluntary association, by right of fraternity, and not oneness of corporation: which appears by astringing and confining in after times the power of Bishops and Ministers to; and within Dioeces and Churches.

Ans. Though it were voluntary, yet might it be necessary and not arbitrary, as was shewed before. The oneness of Corporation was not actual, but habitual. The astringing of them by canon to avoid confusion, took not away their habitual power, for by leave they might act any where, as hath been shewed before. But if they had not been endued with habitual power by office, their voluntary association could not have enabled them to exert their power jointly, when they were met.

Sect. 5.

Let us now hear what witnesses he produceth against the unity and integrity of the Church, and the habitual power of the Ministers beyond the limits of their Congregations, or their joint acting together as Ministers upon a call.

First, *Chrysostome in Serm. 1. de Pasch.* saith; The Sacrifice of Paschever was to be eaten in one house, and not to be conveyed out, i. e. the house is one that hath Christ; and the many houses of the Hebrews have but only one power, nature and condition, as the Churches throughout the whole world, and in several Provinces, being many in number, are but one Church.

But wherein doth he differ from the Presbyterians herein? They grant the Churches are many in number *divisim*, and yet make but one *conjunctim* habitually. But he is expressly against *M. Ellis*, for he grants Provincial Churches; and that all the Churches throughout the whole world are one, and this must be one integral, for a *Genus* is not made by aggregation of Provinces. And all these though organized are similar parts of the whole, having but one only power, nature and condition.

2. *Clement Alexandr. lib. 7. Strom.* There is absolutely but one ancient and Catholike Church in the unity of one faith. And say not the Presbyterians the same also? and it appears he held the Catholike Church to be an Integral, because he saith it is ancient, but a *Genus* never groweth ancient.

He might have gone higher, for another *Clement* in his constitutions

tations, who (if he be of any credit) speaks more home. Nos Sact. 5.
Apostoli scripsimus vobis Catholicam hanc doctrinam ad fulcien-
dum & confirmandum vos, quibus universalis Episcopatus creditus
est, τὴς καθόλου ἐκκλησίας πρεσβυτέρων Constit. 6. c. 14.

But Basil in Ep. ad Neo-Cæsarienses will be of more credit,
"Interrogate patres vestros & annuntiabunt vobis, etiamsi loci
"sive diuise sunt paræcie, tamen veluti coronamento quodam
"unita, inâque sententiâ gubernata fuerint. Assidua quidem po-
"puli fuit inter se commixtio: ipsi pastores verò tantâ prædici fue-
"runt mutuâ charitate, ut alius alio præceptore ac duce usi
"sunt.

And Cyprian's testimony de unitate Ecclesie is direct against
him; for he defineth the unity of the Church by doctrine and
discipline. As there is one God, one Christ, one faith; so there
is one Church, one discipline in it, one Bishoprick, &c. Episco-
patus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. Now Bi-
shoprick argueth the Church to be one politically (though but
habitually) and as many that are bound in a bond *pro toto* & in
solido, are every one liable to be arrested for the whole; so many
that have a joint interest in a thing in *solidum*, have all a joint
right to the whole. Upon which words of Cyprian M. Parker
in Polit. Eccles. lib. 3. pag. 122. hath this inference. "Quid
"ni & unitas Ecclesie in uno Petro primitiis designata, unitatem,
"id est aequalitatem authoritatis in singulis Ecclesijs quibusque de-
"notet? sic ut Ecclesia una sit, & Ecclesiastica potestas una, cujus
"ab Ecclesijs singulis pars in solidum tenetur.

Cyprian is abundant in this point, Episcopatus unus est Epis-
coporum multorum concordie numerositate diffusus. Cypr. Ep. 53.
Esi pastores multi sumus, unum tamen gregem pascimus, & oves
universas, &c. colligere & fovere debemus. Ep. 67. Cyprian gather-
ed together an authoritative Synod. He stoutly opposed Steven
Bishop of Rome for receiving some Bishops that were justly de-
posed, pro sua quam gerebat universalis Ecclesia curâ. Cyp. lib. 1.
Ep. 4.

"Ut unitatem Dominus manifestaret, unam Cathedram consti-
"tuit, & unitatem ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua autori-
"tate disposuit. Cyp. de unitate, Upon which words Salmasius
hath this Comment, "Omnes Ecclesia una sunt, & unita uno

Chap. 8.

"*conspirantes faciunt omnes Cathedra unam Cathedram, De Prim,*
pag. 87.

Ecclesia nomine, non tantum una sed multorum unitas designatur. Bernard in Cant. Serm. 61.

Augustine in Tract. in Job. 1. 14. is more against him then for him. And whereas he saith, *universa Ecclesia ligat solvitque peccata*, He cannot mean thereby that the Church is only one in nature and kinde, but not in number, because he speaks of Priesthood, and what one Minister doth binde is bound to all, so that he violates (saith he) the rights of holy Priesthood that joins him to himself that is cast out by another. Neither doth *Eucherius* (by his own relation, for I have not seen him) say any other thing then the Presbyterians; in that he saith the Church dispersed throughout the whole world consisteth in one and the same faith, and fellowship of Catholike truth.

And whereas there is an innumerable multitude of the faithful, yet they are rightly said to have one heart, and one soul in respect of their society in the common faith and love. For he grants in these words an universal visible Church, and that to be a society, now every society of men is one external visible integral. And *M. Ellis* granteth that there doth flow an external communion from the internal, and that the mystical union doth imply an union visible also. *vind. pag. 34.*

His quotation out of the Council of *Trent* might well have been spared, for it crosseth himself most. Therein is confessed a general Council, and that with authority, and the major part to binde the rest. Indeed they contend that a Council bindeth not the absent Churches which have no delegates there: and who saith the contrary? But as those Churches who had delegates there are concerned in their decrees (so they be agreeable to the word) and that formally, because they are their decrees: so should the Church-Catholike if the whole had delegates there. But this we gain by this quotation, that a general Council is confessed by him to have doctrinal authority; and are not the keys equally extensible? Have they power to decide points of doctrine (as is there confessed by *M. Ellis*) and not

not to exercise discipline? who cut one key shorter then the Sect. 5.
other? It is granted also here, that Councils have to do with
matters of common right and joint concernment. And there-
by the necessity of Synods and Councils will follow, seeing
there are things of common right to many Churches, and may
be to all. And this will necessarily require that they should be
furnished with authority to transact those affairs of common
concernment, and that is as much as the Presbyterians contend
for in the behalf of Synods. "No State (saith he) can take my
"wife from me, or dispose of my children in marriage: this is
"of peculiar right: so in Churches. *Ans.* No more can the
Elders of the particular Congregation; nor the civil Officers of
the particular Town. But the civil Officers or State can dispose
of mens children and good (according to Law) for the good and
defence of the whole, notwithstanding a mans peculiar right,
So the peculiar rights of persons and Congregations must be sub-
servient and give way to the good of the whole, or the greater
part.

And though a master of a family ought not to yield up his
family-government over wife, children and servants, to rule them
in common with other Masters of families, as M. A. and M. S.
note in their *Def.* p. 110. yet if he abuse his government over
them, the wronged persons either wife, children or servants, may
be relieved by the Magistrate, who yet hath no constant actual
hand in the family-government.

And whereas he saith, all the Christians in *England* would be
loth to stand bound to the determinations of 2. or 3. sent in
their names to a general Council. I answer by retortion, so
would a Congregation or our Nobility and Gentry be loth to
stand bound by the censures of two or three Elders in a particu-
lar Congregation without relief.

But it is pretended by M. *Ellis* to be new also relatively in
reference to the Protestant Divines. *Calvin* is brought in here,
vind. p. 13, It is true *Calvin* saith, *Instit.* lib. 4. cap. 1. sect. 3. *Ad
amplendam Ecclesiam unitatem nihil opus est Ecclesiam ipsam
oculis cernere, vel manibus palpere, quin potius ea quod in fide
fida est.* But his meaning is, we cannot distinguish the elect
from the reprobate by sense, referring it to what he had spo-
ken.

Chap. 8.

ken in the former Section. *Soli Deo permittenda est cognitio sue Ecclesie*, sect. 2. *Deus mirabiliter Ecclesiam suam quasi in latibris servat.*

But here Mr. Ellis cites a man for him who is directly against him. For Calvin makes the Ministry of man which God useth in governing the Church, to be the chief sinew whereby the faithful cohere together in one body, *Inst.* 1. 4. c. 3. s. 2. where also he dilates upon *Eph.* 4. 4. &c. and saith it is meant of the Church militant only. And in *sect.* 7. he saith, though the Minister be tied to the particular Congregation, yet he may not only help other Churches, but may be removed to other Churches, of the public utility require it.

And for Councils he saith, *l.* 4. c. 9. s. 1. That he revered the ancient Councils, *ex animo*, and wisheth all other men did so. And saith the promise in *Mat.* 18. 20. where two or three are gathered together in my name, &c. as it reacheth to particular Assemblies, so also to a general Council, *sect.* 2. And he giveth to Councils power *dogmatical*, and saith there is no better remedy against errors, as I cited the words upon the like occasion before, *Nullum est melius remedium*, &c. and also *Dialectick* power, c. 10. s. 27. in making constitutions according to the general rules, *1 Cor.* 14. 40. and jurisdiction c. 11. not only doctrinal binding and loosing, but disciplinary by inflicting censures, s. 2. and c. 12. s. 22. sheweth the ancient manner of yearly Synods, and of appeals if any were wronged by their Bishops, and not only the relief of the wronged person, but the deposition of the Bishop, or suspension for a time from communion. And he saith, that alwaies before one Synod ended, the time and place for another was set, and then complains that these things were now out of date.

So that Calvin was not against an habitual unity of the whole Church, nor against the exerting of the Ministerial power beyond the particular Congregation, or exerting it *conjunctim*, in Synods and Councils.

Chamier also hath been alledged for it before. And the difference is vast between the Church Catholike visible, which our Divines deny, and this, as hath been shewed before, *Chap.* 5. *Sect.* 4.

M. Ellis's second just (or rather unjust) prejudice, is from the dangerous consequences of this opinion. But indeed they flow from his ill stating of the Question; and not from the Tenet it self. Sect. 6.

To the first, viz. a necessity of universal and general Officers, and some one above the rest, to whom the particular Churches may have continual recourse, hath been answered before, *Cha. 7. Sect. 6.*

To the second, viz. the necessity of a continual standing Court, Sect. 6. hath been already answered, *Cha. 7. Sect. 10.* The suiting of the Church too much to worldly policy, occasioneth this scruple. And yet we see that Parliaments, and Diets civil, are not standing continual Courts, no more need Councils Ecclesiastical be. And whereas he saith it were notably vain to imagine that Christ hath committed the government of his Church first, and chiefly to that body that should not meet six times in sixteen hundred years, nay never.

I answer, that I never affirmed a general Council to be the first subject of the keys, nor the *London-Ministers*, that I can finde, nor *Apollonius*, that I remember. But the Church-Officers in general, in opposition to the *cæus fidelium*, or the civil Magistrate, &c. A general Council is but occasional, yet is it *Reverend* and *August*, and of more large extent, by reason of the general delegation, then any other meeting; and is full of authority, for the exerting of all Ecclesiastical power of the keys, as I conceive. The gift of the keys was primarily to the whole body of Officers, or Organs of the Church respectively, as their Offices were capable of them: and as they were given to the Apostles together, so they may be exercised together: And secondarily to the particular Ministers or Officers, as being a part of that body. And though the power habitually considered be indefinite, yet the constant, actual exercise thereof is in their particular Congregations or Classes.

The Ordinances of God, for the enjoyment and use of them, were given to the whole visible Church for the conversion and edification of the Elect, and if they could meet together, as the Israelites did in the wilderness, and the Saints (for ought I know) shall in heaven, they might partake of them together,

Chap. 8. ther, as their rightful portion, but because they cannot meet but in parcels, therefore they have right to enjoy them *divisim*, by vertue of that general gift to the whole, which every Congregation or parcel appropriates to it self, as being a member of the whole : and yet it is not notably vain to say, The gift of them by God, and his intention in giving them, was to the whole, though they never meet, nor can meet together in this world.

So is the case of the Ministers also, the Ministry is primarily given to the whole body of them, and if they could meet together they might exercise the keys together *conjunctim* (a representation, or an epitome whereof is in a general council) but because they cannot meet but in parcels where they are seated, and have a particular call to give especial attendance, therefore they exercise them *divisim*, yet as parts of the whole body of Organs of the Church ; and there they serve the whole Church, and their dispensations have influence into the whole.

The third danger, *viz.* the trouble and charge of appeals, and the tryal of causes by them that can have no personal knowledge of the cause, or persons to be tried, but by information, hath been answered before. c. 7. f. 9.

Sett. 7.

His third prejudice is, that this opinion is *Papal* and *Anti-Protestant*. And to prove this he bringeth in *Bellarmines* description of the Church-Catholike, *viz.* That it is one visible Church "or Congregation of men bound together by the profession of "the same faith, and participation of the same Sacraments, "under the government of lawful Pastors, and especially of "that only Vicar of Christ on earth, the *Pontiffe* or *Bishop of Rome*. This latter clause indeed is papal properly, and therefore justly rejected by the Protestants. But the former part if it be understood of one habitual body or Congregation, is not to be accounted Papal, because set down by a Papist. for then all the Articles of the Creed which they hold as well as we (though not on the same ground) should be accounted Papal also. Where they differ from the Scripture therein they erre, and therein only we dissent from them.

Neither

Neither is it *Anti-protestant* (unless as he hath stated it) Sect. 7.
Calvins judgement (whom he citeth here again) I have shewed
before, and it is opposite to *M. Ellu* in point of the power of
the ministerial office beyond one Congregation (which is the
very hinge of the question) and in the power and use of Sy-
nods. *Chamier* indeed makes the Church to be one general or
universal: yet he makes it to be aggregated of many particular
Churches, which strongly argues an Integrality, for no *Ge-
nus* is made by aggregation, and he saith it is compounded
of infinite particular Churches, but no *genus* is made by compo-
sition, *Omne aggregatum & compositum est integrale*. He makes
it also to consist of many parts, yea, to have *partes extra partes*,
which is the Logicians definition of an integral. But how all
the Kingdoms in the world (as he saith, to make a parallel
with the universal Church) may be called one Kingdom
in the general (except by logical abstraction) I understand
not. Certainly it cannot be by aggregation and compo-
sition, and by apposition of them as parts of that gene-
ral Kingdome he speaks of, which yet he yieldeth in the
Church-Catholike. They have not all the same systeme of
written Laws, authorized by the same authority, neither have
they indefinite habitual Officers, as the Church hath.

And for Bishop *Jewel* in his answer to *Harding*, he disputes
against the headship of the Pope, but denyeth not Christ to be
head of the visible Church. And though indeed he rightly calls
it a new fancy, to prove the Pope to be head of the Church
from *Ecce ego & filii*, as if there were therefore but one King to
rule over the whole world, yet he denieth not that Christ rules
over the whole Church, but calls the Church *One Kingdom, One
body, One sheepfold*. And he citeth for the unity of the Church
many sentences out of *Cyprian*, viz. "*Una est Ecclesia a Chri-
sto per totum mundum in plura membra divisa. Item Episcopa-
tus unus, Episcoporum concordia numerositate diffusus, Cyp. l. 4.
Ep. 2. Also, Ecclesia una est, & connexa, & coherentium sibi in-
vicem Sacerdotum glutine copulata, Ep. 9. Quando oramus, non
pro uno oramus, sed pro toto populo: quia totus populus unus
sumus, Cyp. in Orat. Dominic. Again, Hanc unitatem firmiter
tenere, & vindicare debemus, maxime Episcopi, qui in Ecclesia
præsi-*"

Chap. 8.

"*presidemus: ut Episcopatum quoque ipsum unum & indivisum*
 "*prohemus, Cyp. l. 3. Ep. 13. Esi pastores multi sumus, unum ta-*
 "*men gregem pascimus, &c. Copiosum est Corpus Sacerdotum,*
 "*concordia mutua glusine atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si*
 "*quis ex collegio nostro heresim facere, & gregem Christi lacerare,*
 "*de vastare tentaverit, subveniant ceteri. Ibid.*

So that Jewel was far from restraining the Ministers office or power to one Congregation, or from denying the authority of Synods and Councils.

And for M. Rutherford in his *Due rights of Presbytery*, I marvel M. Ellis should cite him, who is professedly point black against him, and hath handled both parts of my question, and concludes them affirmatively, *Due Rights of Presbyteries*, p. 55. &c. and 418. Now whose fault is it to cite authors for him, that are known to be against him?

Sect. 8.

I come now to view his *greater Artillery* (as he calls it) and his first argument is, because (saith he) the Scriptures, Christ, and his Apostles are silent, and speak nothing of one Catholike visible Church: yea (I may adde) and all men else, as he hath flased it. But for Scripture-proofs I referre the Reader to what I said formerly, and now have added, Chap. 2. But my proofs from Scripture he was pleased to runne over in *vind.* pag. 42. in 7. lines without any answer to the particulars.

His second argument is from the institution of Christ; because (saith he) the keys of government were given first and fully, entirely and immediatly to the particular Congregation; and this he proves from the Church of the Jews, to which all Church-power was given first and fully: but this was (saith he) a particular Church, not the universal, unlesse by accident, because there was no other Church-state in the world at that time. And though he grants it to be a Type of the Church of the New Testament, yet not as Catholike, but as Congregational as it self was, or else as mystical. *Kind.* pag. 21.

Answ. It cannot be denied but there were some things peculiar to the Church of the Jews, as typical Ordinances, and a typical high Priest, and that it was bounded within certain limits,

mits, and they were bound to meet, in their males three times Sec. 8.
yearly; which pertain not to the Evangelical Church. But in
that one Church there were particular Assemblies for ordinary
worship, and extraordinary also, and for acts of government,
and they had particular Officers, and Ecclesiastical rulers over
them: and there were appeals reserved to the great Council
at *Jerusalem*, and so it could not be a type of a Congregation-
al Church, for there can be no appeals to that, it being the
lowest Church that can be. The particular *Synagogues* were ra-
ther Types of the Congregational Churches, for they are cal-
led by the same name, *1am. 2. 20*. And the Ministers under the
Gospel are called by the same names that the indefinite Offi-
cers of the Jewish Church were, *viz. Priests and Levites, Isa.*
66. 21. which place is spoken of the time under the Gospel.
And if it be granted that the Ministers of the Gospel be given
to the whole Church, as the Priests and Levites were indefinitely
to the whole Church of the Jews, notwithstanding any parti-
cular relation to the particular Synagogues and places they re-
sided in, and taught, or judged in, it is as much as I contend for.
And if by mystical he meaneth the elect only, or entitively only;
it could not be a type of the Church-Catholike so, for the Jewish
Church was visible and organical.

His second proof is from *Mat. 18. Tell the Church*, which
saith he was a particular Congregation which was endued with
entire power even to excommunication. *Whatsoever ye shall*
bind, &c.

Ans. This was not the Institution, neither was there any
donation of the keys, but a supposal of the keys in the parti-
cular Churches, which is a thing confessed by all (and this
power was also in the Jewish Synagogues) But this is not spo-
ken exclusively, that this power is no where else. If the rulers
of the Synagogue had power to excommunicate (to which
it is like Christ alluded in that speech) then much more the
Sanadrim, or highest Court: and so I conceive it is in the Church
of the New Testament: If the least combination of Elders have
this power given them for matters that concern that Congre-
gation only, then much more a greater company and combi-
nation, for matters that concern a greater part of the Church

Chap. 8.

under their combination, and for matters of greater moment then can be transacted by the smaller company. But the donation of the keys was to the Apostles together, and they were general Officers, and stood in relation to no particular Church, and therefore the keys come to the particular Congregation or Ministry there, as to parts of the whole company of Organs, yet immediatly, and not by commission from any Catholike Court.

His third proof is, because the first execution of the greatest act of entire power was exercised in a particular Church, without consulting with the universal Church (though the Apostles were then surviving) 1 Cor. 5.

Ans. For ought that I know the Church of *Corinth* was a Classical Church, and not a meer Congregational one, for there were Churches in it, 1 Cor. 14. 34. Besides the probability that *Cenchrea* was a member thereof. But Sir who requires the consulting with the Church-Catholike in admitting or ejecting members? Or did the particular Synagogues consult with the *Sanhedrim*, or the whole Church of the Jews when they excommunicated any man? Surely they had work enough to do then.

His fourth proof or argument is Because entire power was committed to particular men, *viz.* the Apostles severally, and to all jointly, and therefore not to one visible governing Church. *Find. p. 23.*

Ans. By this argument it appears, the power is given not to the Congregation, but to the Ministers, whose representatives the Apostles were in receiving the keys, severally and jointly, which is as much as the Presbyterians require, *viz.* that the Ministers have power to exercise their ordinary power jointly together upon a call, as well as severally in their particular Congregations, as the Apostles did their extraordinary. Their receiving the keys together signified their representation of the Ministers not multiplied only (as M. *Ellis* would evade it) but conjoynd.

His fifth argument is from the reproofs given by Christ to the 7. several Churches in the *Revelation*, and not to the combination of them, though near one another.

Ans.

Ans. For ought appears they might be all Presbyterial Sect. 9.
Churches, and not Congregational only. The Church of *Ephesus*
was one, and that was of more Congregations then one, as hath
been shewed before. But how doth this prove these Churches
were not, or might not actually have been in combination, if
civil authority would have permitted? Were not the Elders of
the several Churches worthy of blame for not doing their duty
in their several Churches? Or will combinations of Congrega-
tions now in Classes or Provinces, free their Ministers from
blame in neglecting their duties in their particular Congrega-
tions? A Classis or Synod is not to be blamed for the faults
in a particular Congregation, which ought to be censured in
the particular, and not there, neither indeed can be, except
they had been brought before them. The several Churches
there had their several faults, and therefore though the Epistle
is written to the seven, yet it was needful the reproofs should
be applied to them severally. And yet some think that the
whole Epistle was written and sent to all the 7. Churches, from
Rev. I. 4. 11.

His second sort of Arguments are from the matter and mem- Sect. 9,
bers of the Church, and he makes it necessary that the whole
Church should be gathered together into one place, as the Jew-
ish Church was, and Corporations in their hals, and Kingdoms
in their Parliaments: And this he saith I deny against all experi-
ence and reason, *Kind. p. 24.*

Ans. This hath been answered before among the Objections.
I adde further that though usually it is so that there are
some general meetings in worldly politics, that are several ac-
tual governments, yet it is not alwaies so, as hath been shew-
ed, and where it is so it is a fruit and effect and token of liber-
ty, but ariseth not meerly from unity: because there have been
politics that had them not: for this Kingdom was one a good
while before there were any Parliaments, and after they were
granted they were but occasional: and so there may be occasio-
nal meetings in general Councils, only the vastnes of the Church,
and diversity of civil governments and governours render them
very difficult in our daies.

But he saith that such an oneness as is in regard of kinde and
nature

Chap. 8.

nature in all the Churches, and in relation to the same head, and in order to, and dependance upon one rule or Law, the word of God, is no actual or real oneness, but in imagination and conceit.

Ans. It is not actual indeed but habitual, as hath been said many times over, yet it is real, as well as the four monarchies were real monarchies and not in imagination only and conceit. He might as well make the head of the Church, and the Laws of the Church, and the Covenant of grace, and the seals of the Covenant to be but imaginary and in conceit, as the Church-Catholike, for they are the bonds of the unity, and real visible bonds make not an imaginary integral, but a real. And where (I pray) is this oneness denied by the brethren, as you alledge, *Vin. p. 24.* The enlargement and confirmation of this argument, *A non existentia, & ab impossibilitate existendi*, have been answered before, *Ch. 7. Sect. 10.*

Sect. 10.

A third sort of argument he takes from the form and nature of all bodies incorporate, which consist in order of superiour and inferiour, &c.

But Christs Kingdom is not to be regulated herein according to worldly policies (as himself also elsewhere in his *vind.* hath noted) so also Christ hath said of the Officers of his Kingdom, that *it shall not be so among you, Mat. 20. 26. i. e.* there shall be no superiority among you: and yet they were to be Officers of a body, a kingdom, an Ecclesiastical polity. But this difficulty is easily salved, because though one particular Officer hath not power over another, yet the greater number in actual consociation, or combination, hath over the lesse: as it is in a Parliament, or any meeting of the like nature, where all the members are equal *divisim*, severally taken, yet the lesse number is ruled, yea, censurable by the greater, if there be cause.

Divers inconveniences he raiseth from hence, As 1. *a necessary existence in one place, and why not at Rome?* 2. *Constant standing Officers.* To these have been answered before. 3. *A common form of faith, discipline, worship, and profession, agreed on and formally propounded and taken.* I answer, these are for the essentials one in the Church-Catholike, set down in the word; and so acknowledged

ledged often by himself, and they are submitted unto *divisim*, Sect. 11. by the whole Church. 4. *that all must act by authority, and by virtue of commission from the Church-Catholike, and in the name of the Church-Catholike*: and this the Assertors of this opinion (saith he) say expressly. I answer, it is a meer figment of his own brain, and a great injury to those he fastens it upon.

And hence the fifth inconvenience (*viz.* that the Magistrate cannot reform within his own dominions, before he hath authority derived from the Church-Catholike, either in a general Council, or from their Committee) falls to the ground. For as the Ecclesiastical Officers of particular Churches have power from Christ, and not from a general Council, to reform their own Congregations, if they be able: so also the Magistrate within his dominions, is *Custos utriusq; tabula*, and hath a power *circa sacra*, though not *in sacris*: not intrinsically as a Church-Officer, yet extrinsically as a nursing father; and so the Kings of Judah had, without authority derived to them from the *Synedrion*.

But I should think that this Inconvenience lighteth unavoidably upon such as derive the power of the Minister from the people of a particular Congregation, and make them to act as their servants in their name, and according to their votes: for then If the Congregation grow corrupt, they may cast off their faithful Elders, but their Elders cannot reform them, if they be unwilling; and in a corrupt or infected condition, whether by errour or prophanenesse, they will not be willing to reform.

The sixth inconvenience of a solemn meeting for the election of such general Officers, is answered already, C. 7. S. 7.

The inconvenience of meeting in a general Council by reason of multitude, is salved by delegates rightly chosen. And the difference of languages is salved by learning. That was no impediment in the *Council of Nice*, or any of the general or large Councils. Neither doth this hinder Princes (as himself confesseth) from one end of the world to another, to hold mutual correspondency.

His fourth sort of arguments (that so he might seem to Sect. 11. fetch an argument from every cause) is from the end of the

Chap. 8.

Authors of this opinion, *Vind.* pag. 29. Either it is (saith he) to sound the right of Presbyterian government as is now endeavoured, and to deprive particular Churches of entire power in themselves, or at least of Independency in their government from other Churches: or else to lay a groundwork of a more effectual cure and remedy then hitherto, for all distempers of particular Churches.

An. The Presbyterian government spoileth not Congregations of that due power which Christ hath given them, but helpeth and strengthens them in things of greater difficulty wherein they are too weak, and regulateth male-administrations in the particular Congregations, it serveth for the transacting of businels of common concernment: it preserveth unity in the Church which is the body and family of Christ: it suppresseth errors and heresies that arise and spread to the infecting of more Congregations then one, or which particular Congregations cannot suppress.

And as for absolute independency, as it is disavowed by M. *Ellis*, and (as he saith) by the greatest patrons of that way in this Kingdom, and beyond the seas: so that way which is provided thereby for the curing of error and scandal, meerly by advice and swasion, which may or may not be followed *ad libitum*, it is not a sufficient remedy against obstinacy therein: and for the Non-communication of Churches by sister-Churches without authority, I fear it will prove unwarrantable, and is a *verbal* though not *formal* censuring of them, though their equals; and is a way not to cure Churches, but to cause rents in the Church of Christ, and confusion.

Neither can this associating of Churches together open a wide gap to tyranny, as M. *Ellis* affirms, any more then associating of families into Congregations, where the irregularities and miscarriages even in their particular houses are reproveable and censurable, is a spoiling of families of their liberties, and a tyrannizing over them. The actual union of a Congregation, and the constant, near inspection of the Officers over the the particular families, will more (in the eye of reason) intrench upon family-liberties, and call them oftner to censure, then the habitual union of the whole body, or association of Churches remote, who

who can when they meet (which is but seldom) handle only *Sec. 11.* matters of joint concernment, and of presumed male-administration brought to them by complaint, can infringe the liberties of those Congregations. And if the Church in general be a society to all its members, to which there belong certain common rights and priviledges, as spiritual food, the Word and Sacraments (as M. Ellis confesseth) why not spiritual physick also, which is as necessary?

Obj. The whole world is one humane society under God the creator and governour thereof, *1 Chron. 29 11. All that is in the heaven, and in the earth is thine: thine is the Kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all.* And yet this makes them not one Kingdom politically, no not habitually; but they are distinct Kingdoms, notwithstanding they have the same head, and the same Law of nature common to them all. And therefore the identity of the head and Laws of the Church-Catholike are not sufficient to make them one Ecclesiastical visible (though but) habitual Kingdom or body.

Ans. There is not *par ratio*. For first, the laws of nature are not one entire, explicate body of written Laws, as Christs Laws for his visible Church are, but internal and invisible written in the heart only, and that but dimly, and not apprehended by all, in all the parts thereof alike, through ignorance, rudeness, barbarism, or evil customs.

Secondly, There are no Officers of the whole world, as it is a society, directed by the internal Law of nature: but so there are of the visible Church: and Therefore the visible Church is more then a society, it is Christs external, political Kingdom.

Thirdly, There are several chief governours over the several Kingdoms of the world, which are Gods vicegerents, and Gods appointed ones in their Kingdoms; and written municipal laws belonging to every Kingdom, distinct from other Kingdoms; and priviledges proper to the several Kingdoms, wherein the subjects of other Kingdoms partake not. But Christ hath set no such several, suprem, appointed ones over the several Churches, nor permitted the several Churches to make any different laws from his, nor from those laws which are common to the whole Church.

And

Chap. 2.

And the priviledges of the Church are common to all the members of the severall Churches, and they have freedom to communicate together in the holy Ordinances, wherever they dwell.

Fourthly, The Law of nature is given by God as an invisible Creator, the Laws of the Church are given by Christ, a God man, as a Mediator. As he is God he hath an essential right to be governour of angels and men, and all other creatures, but as Mediatour he hath a donative Kingdom of grace, and is a political head of an external visible Kingdom, which is but one.

Fifthly, All mankind are not entred into one body by one external instituted sign, badge, enrowlment, and initial seal, nor are entred into one explicit, actual Covenant, nor make an explicit, actual profession of subjection to the same God, or to the same systeme of written Laws. And therefore that parallel which these two reverend Ministers M. Allen and M. Shepard (whom I love and reverence much in the Lord) endeavour to draw between mankind and the Oecumenical Church in their *Distance unto the nine questions or positions*, p. 79. will not suit and agree in all things.

6. Yet as all men are one society, though they want Officers, as such, yet are they bound to combine, even from that internal union, to preserve themselves, and maintain the Law of nature: Suppose there were some *circumcelliones* or some *conjurors* that sought to destroy mankind in general, not because they are of this or that Kingdom, upon some particular quarrel, but because they are men: or that endeavoured to poison and infect the air, or let in the sea to drown the earth, or take away the light of the Sun (if such things were possible) or any kinde of wilde beast should multiply that would destroy all mankind; then all mankind setting aside their particular immunities, combinations, Laws, yea, and quarrels, ought and would unite themselves *as men* to preserve mankind, and oppose such common enemies of mankind. Forreign Nations will combine to vindicate *ius Gentium* if it be violated. All Nations combine against *Pirates*, notwithstanding particular distinctions and oppositions, yea, so far as mens positive laws are general, as the

the civil Law reacheth far over many Kingdoms, if there be any Sect. 11.
oppositions or obstructions that hinder the exercise thereof, for
common good; all that submit themselves thereunto would not-
withstanding their particular distinctions joyn together to re-
move the same.

Much more then ought there to be an union and combination
between the severall parts of the Church, which hath the same
head and King over the whole, of our own nature, who hath
given us one systeme of written laws, and but one charter for
the whole, and made Officers for the good of the whole, en-
dowing them with an habitual power of office to administer all his
Ordinances in any part of the Church upon a call. And if they
could meet together, they might actually teach and rule the
whole Church, as one Congregation, as M. Ellis granteth: and
because they cannot so meet, yet by the same reason if a great
part of them meet together, the Elders set over them may teach
and rule them jointly together, as well as severally asunder. For
the greater number of Churches being considered as combined
and confociated parts of the whole, bear the same relation in a
proportion to the lesse, that the greater number in the same Con-
gregation do to the lesse: and therefore if the major part in the
Congregational Eldership shall overrule the lesse by their votes,
so by proportion shall the greater number of any greater Pres-
bytery whether *Classical, Provincial, or National, &c.* being in
actual confociation and combination, overrule the lesse, if they
dissent.

But because there are so many superstitions, errors and here-
sies in the *Asian, African, European and American Churches*, as
M. A. and M. S. in their *defence* p 92. do take notice of, (which
book I confesse it was mine unhappinesse not to hear of until
this treatise of mine was transcribed for the presse, and who
have dealt exceeding candidly upon this question, and seem to
yield the fairest concessions toward the universality, unity, inte-
grality, and priority of the whole Church in some respects of
reason, pag. 77. though not so much as is contended for) yet I
say for these things sake, I should be very tender in defining
(as the case now standeth) what Churches, or how farre the vi-
sible Churches may with convenience or safety enter into a-
ctual

Quest. 2. dual combination, lest the truths of God, or the liberties of the more sound and pure Churches should be prejudiced thereby.

The second Question.

I come now to handle the predicate of my Question, which I may well call a second Question, and that is, *Which of these two Churches is Prima or first, and which Secundaria or secondary?*

Se. 1.

BEfore I answer, I desire it may be remembered that the comparison is not between the invisible and the visible Church, but between the visible Catholike Church, and the particular visible Churches. And then I answer, I conceive the Church-Catholike visible is *prima*, and the particular Churches are *secundariae*, and in that sense *prima*, as being ministerially converted and admitted by it.

But for our better understanding of this priority, I shall first set down what kinde of priority this is, and what not. I doe not mean a priority of time, as if the Church-Catholike should be *antiquior*, *antiquioris* & *antiquioris* *quidam* and yet the Evangelical Church was first set up in time, before there were any divisions into particular Churches: but now it is divided, the members that are born in the several Congregations, enter into the general and particular Churches, *simul tempore*, though not *ante* & *postea*. As a freeman in London takes up his freedom of the City, and of such a hall or company at once. But those that are born in it, and converted to it, find the Church-Catholike already constituted before them even in time. Also, I do not mean in regard of constitution of the whole political Kingdom of Christ by aggregation and combination, as M. Hooker understands me, for the particular Congregations must exist before they can be combined and aggregated. Neither do I mean in regard of operation, for now the Church is constituted

constituted, and divided into particular combinations, the particular Churches are first in their ordinary operations. And yet the Evangelical Church did put forth operations at first, before any such divisions, and without any reference to them.

But positively I mean the Church-Catholike is before the particular.

1. *Intentione divinâ*, in Gods intention: as Nature intends first the whole man, and not any part of man, although the parts are in some sense before the whole in consideration, for the whole is made up of them.

2. *Institutione divinâ* in regard of Gods institution. God did first institute the whole by one Charter, Covenant and systeme of Laws, and the particular Congregations secondarily, for convenient communication of persons, and transactions of business. *Go teach all Nations* was the first Commission after Christs resurrection.

3. *Donatione divinâ*, for the Ordinances and priviledges of the Church were first given to the whole, and secondarily to the particular Congregations: as the priviledges of any Kingdom and Corporation are.

4. The Church-Catholike is *prior dignitate* in dignity, a Kingdom is of more dignity and honour then any particular town; and a city then any street or ward. The whole hath more dignity then any part. Yea, and I may say also in authority, for the authority of the whole is greater in divers respects then of the parts.

5. *Perfectione*, for the perfection of the whole is made up of the perfection of the parts, a whole Kingdom of the parts of it: and any whole comprizeth the perfection of the parts of it; a particular street or ward is an imperfect, incomplete thing, and not consistent alone, but as a part in reference to the whole: and as a member in reference to the whole body. The particulars may have the perfection of parts, and some be more perfect then others, but the whole is most perfect; and the perfections of the parts concur in the perfection of the whole.

6. *Entitive* or *essentialiter*, the Church-Entitive is before the Organical, for the organical is made up of the members of the

Quest. 2. the Church-Entitive, and the Church-Entitive affords materials to the Church-organical. And in this respect the particular Churches are properly *esse*, arising out of the Entitive: and so also is the whole Church-organical, for it ariseth out of the combination of the particular Congregations, and both it and they consist only of members of the Church Entitive. And herein I consent unto M. Parker in this sense; but not that the habitual power of Elders should arise from the particular Congregations to act in Synods, but only in regard of their evocation, and exciting of their power to act in reference to them *pro his & uno*.

7. *Causalitate efficientis Ministerialis*, For the Church-Catholike already converted is a means of converting more unto them, as opportunity is afforded, and of admitting ministerially into the Church-Catholike both entitive first, and then organical, both private members and also Officers into their habitual office.

8. *Cognitione sive noscibilitate perfecta*. For though this or that Congregation be *proprior ad sensum*, and so *notior respectu nostri*, which is *cognitione confusa*, yet the Church-Catholike is *universalior & animas noscibilior simpliciter*. *Distincta enim cognitio sequitur ordinem naturæ, in se, & in mente bene dispositâ*. As *universalia sunt notiora minus universalibus, & species infima, indivisibilia*. The Kingdom of England as a Kingdom is *propius ad rationem*, and so *noscibilior distincta ratione*: but particular towns are *propiora ad sensum*. The notion of an English man comes first upon a subject of this Kingdom, before of a Suffolk man.

A man may have knowledge of England as a Kingdom, and be well skilled in the polity, laws, and priviledges thereof, and yet by sense have but little or no knowledge of particular Towns: so a man may know much of the Church, as Christs Kingdom, and be well skilled in the Laws, Ordinances, and priviledges thereof, and yet know but few particular Churches.

So that the priority of the Church-Catholike visible, in respect of the particulars, is like the priority of a Kingdom to the parts of it, or of a Corporation in respect of the parts

of it; which is not meant in a mathematical or techtonical consideration, for so the particular buildings are *prima*, and the whole city *aris*, yet so M. Hooker understood me in his acute arguing about *integrals*, *Supp.* pag. 155. But in regard of *intention*, *institution*, *donation*, of *priviledges*, *dignity*, *perfection*, *essence*, *instrumental efficiency*, and *perfect cognition* of it.

Sec. 2.

There is also a difference between *originum* & *secundarium*, for every *originum* is *secundarium*, but every *secundarium* is not *originum*. But I principally meant *secundarium* or *secondary*: yet in regard the particular Churches arise and spring out of the Church-Entitive, and are converted and admitted ministerially by the Church-Catholike already in being, they may truly be said to be *aris*, and the Catholike *prima*.

First, All the names that are in the Scripture given unto the Church-visible, agree primarily to the Church-Catholike: and secondarily to particular Congregations. As *ἐκκλησία, κυριακή*; we are first considered as called out from Idols, and devoted to be the Lords people, before we can be considered of this or that Congregation. We know they were given even to the Jews, before ever any Congregational Evangelical Churches had existence, *Act. 7. 38. The Church in the wilderness*, And the Jews are frequently called *the Lords people*. So the Church is called *the house of the living God*, *1 Tim. 3. 15. And the ground and pillar of truth*, *Gods vineyard*, *Joh. 15. 1. Wherein branches in Christ bearing no fruit are cut off*, *Christ's sheepfold*, *Joh. 10. 16. Barns floor*, *Mat. 3. 12. Drag-net*, *Wheat-field*, *Kingdom of heaven*, *Mat. 13. 37, 38. A great house wherein are vessels even of dishonour*, *2 Tim. 2. 20. These names cannot be limited or appropriated to any particular Congregation, but are first true of the whole Church, and of every particular Church as a part thereof. Congregationes particulares sunt quasi partes similes Ecclesie Catholice, atque adeo & nomen & natura ejus participant. Ames. med. 1. 1. c. 32. s. 4.*

Sec. 3.

2. That is the primary Church to which the Covenant, Promises, Laws and Priviledges of the Church do primarily belong: but the Covenant, Promises, Laws and Priviledges do primarily belong to the Church-Catholike. Therefore, &c.

Quest. 2.

The minor I prove, because the Covenant of grace and salvation by Christ, and the first Evangelical promise that ever was made in the world, was to *Adam* and *Eve*, representing all mankind; and therefore consequently the whole Church of God. This was before there was any division or distinction made of Churches into Jew and Gentile, National or Congregational.

Again, the main commission for gathering the Evangelical Church was, *Go teach all Nations, and baptize them, in the name of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost, Mat. 28.* And this was before any divisions or subdivisions were appointed: and they were secondarily brought in, for order and convenient administration of Ordinances, and communication of members, and transference of business: and they being similar parts of the whole, receive their particular distinctions from external, accidental, and adventitious particularities, as the places where they exist, the particular Officers set over them; their purity or impurity, eminency or obscurity, multitude or paucity, zeal or remissness, antiquity or late constitution, &c. They all retain the general essential form and difference from heathens, and among themselves, as parts of a similar body, are distinguished but by accidental differences.

And that promise that *the gates of hell shall never prevail against the Church*, is primarily given to the Church-Catholike visible here on earth: For that in heaven is not assailed by the gates of hell, but only that on earth. And though it may seem to be applicable to the invisible only, yet to those as visible; for so they are assailed by persecutions and heresies.

Again, *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, Mar. 16.* This doth primarily belong to the Church-Catholike, and that a visible Church, because capable of Baptism, and though it be applicable to every member of any particular Congregation, yet not as being a member of that particular society or confederation, but as being in the general Covenant, and so a member of the Church-Catholike, to which that promise was made. Yea, look over all the promises in the New Testament, and you shall finde them made in general, without the least respect or reference to the particular confederations or Congregations wherein the believers

beleevers lived. In any similar body, as water, the accidents doe not primarily pertain to this or that particular drop, and secondarily to the whole, but first to the whole, and secondarily to this or that drop. So the promises and priviledges of the Church doe not primarily belong to this or that particular Church, and secondarily to the Catholike: but first to the Catholike, and secondarily to this or that particular Congregation or person, as being a member thereof.

The Laws also are given to the whole Church primarily, as the Laws of *England* are to the whole Kingdom primarily, and to the particular divisions secondarily, and all are bound to obedience not as *Suffolk* or *Essex* men, but as Subjects of this Kingdom. So the Laws of Christ binde every particular Church, but not because in such a particular Covenant or confederation, but because Subjects of Christs visible Kingdom.

The like may be said of the priviledges of the Church. Two main priviledges of the Church are *federal holiness*, of the children of visible beleevers, and *regality*, of the Ordinaries, *the first Beleevers*. Now neither of both these be due any privately as a member of a particular Congregation, but as a member of the Church-Catholike.

For *federal or covenant holiness*, whereby the children of visible beleevers are, *it becometh* no man children because the parents are of this or that, or any Congregation, but because of the Church-Catholike, yea, though but entitive, if under the seal of Baptism.

This I prove thus. That which should have been, though the particular relation to a particular Congregation had never been, and which continueth when the particular relation ceaseth, that is not a proper priviledge of that relation, but such is *federal holiness*, in regard of relation to any particular Congregation. Therefore, &c.

Suppose those baptized by *John Baptist* or by *Christs Disciples* before there were any particular distinctions, should have had any children: or the *Eunuch* (if he were an Eunuch by office only, and not in body) baptized by *Philip*, who went immediately home into his own country, or *Cornelius* and his

Quest. 2. his friends baptized at *Peters* command, should not their children be?

Suppose a Church dissolved by war, the Minister and people slain, or dying by some raging pestilence, and some women left with child, and haply they carried away captive, should not their children be *by*, because the particular relation is extinct? Do not those women remain members of the Church? But they cease to remain members of that particular Church or Integral, for that increased, Therefore of the Church-Catholike or of none. Are they to be accounted without in the Apostles sense? Are visible believers not yet joined in Church-order or fellowship by a particular Covenant to be accounted without? Or is a Congregation deprived of Elders by death, and in that interval destitute of Word, Sacraments, and discipline to be accounted without? Is it the particular joining of a company of private Christians together without Officers, before they be organized, that gives them their right primarily to the Ordinances? I fear, too much is ascribed to that particular conjunction and covenant, and too much weight laid upon it, which is a very accidental thing to our right to Ordinances, and enters not into it at all, but is mutable and extinguishable, without the least impeaching of the right to Ordinances.

If the reason whereupon the Apostle saith the Church of Corinth was not to judge them that were without, was, because they were not within the Church of Corinth, and so not under their particular censure or judgement, this holdeth true of them that be of another society or Congregation, desiring to be admitted to the Sacrament, as well as of such as are no set members, desiring to be received to the Lords Supper. And so all members which are of one society, and without unto another. See *Mr. Balaam* 147. But by forerunners of this world, whom the Apostle pointeth out by the title of being *without*, 1 Cor. 10. 11. he means such as had not received the Covenant of grace: such as were alien from the Common-wealth of *Israel*, strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. And so right to the Ordinances, it ariseth from the general Covenant, and from a privilege primarily belonging to vi-

visible believers, though in no particular consociation, the admission into the particular Congregation only affords an opportunity, because thereby a particular Minister hath taken the charge of him, and must administer the Ordinances to him, which any other Minister may do upon occasion. Sect. 2.

For Baptism, it cannot be a privilege of the particular Covenant, for if a Pagan be converted he must be baptized before he can be admitted a member of the particular Congregation, and this must be by some Minister. Therefore baptism is a privilege of the Church-Entire; and a Minister can, yea, and must sometimes exert his power of office, not only beyond his own Congregation, even into others, but beyond the Church organical into the Church-Entire, to set Christs seal there. And for the children of visible believers though born never so farre from the place where the particular Minister liveth which hath the actual care of his parents, be it by sea or by land, any Minister may administer Baptism to them, because they are holy. *Infantes baptizandi sunt, non ut sancti fiant, sed quia sancti sunt.* Whitak.

Yet his promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are after off; even as many as the Lord our God shall call, saith Peter, Act. 2.39. This promise is that external Covenant to which Baptism doth belong; for it is brought in as an argument to move them to repentance, and receiving of Baptism, and declareth their right, and their childrens right, which is nothing else but the call of God, and their answer thereunto.

The Sacraments are not seals of the particular Covenant, but the general; and therefore all that are in the general Covenant have right thereto, as they are capable. The 5. Apologists acknowledge that some of them had children born after they were actually in this way of communion, which were baptized by some of our Ministers in our Particular Congregations. *Apoll. Narr. p. 6.* And some of our brethren (and none of the meanest) falling hence to New-England, after their departure from their particular Congregations here, and before their particular communion there, had sea-born children, which were baptized on

Quest. 2. ship-board: and I my self was desired to baptize one of them, before the Ship could put forth out of the channel.

And for the Lords Supper, it is a priviledge not springing from the particular Covenant, but the general: and as all that were circumcised were bound to keep the Passover, wherever they dwelt, so every baptized person being of age, and otherwise fit, is bound to receive the Lords Supper, and therefore hath a right thereto, though his condition of calling, or other accidents hinder him from a fixed membership. And in Congregational Churches the brethren of one Congregation communicate at the Lords table in other Congregations, as occasion is offered: but surely it cannot be by vertue of a particular Covenant, entred into with their own members, for that can give right no where else, but it is by vertue of a Covenant that is common to all visible beleevers, which is the general Covenant. Can we conceive that a visible beleever having visible right to Christ, and living holily should want right to the seals? *Can any man forbid Water: that these should not be baptized that have received the holy Ghost as well as we?* saith Peter of Cornelius and his company. So (may I say) can any man forbid the Lords Supper to be administered to such as have received Christ, and his Spirit, and are baptized as well as we? See more of this, *Que. 2. Sect. 4.*

M. Norton in his answer to Apollonius, p. 32 acknowledgeth the Sacraments are not signs or seals of the Ecclesiastical Covenant (as he calls it) but signs and seals of the Covenant of grace, and yet the Sacraments are to be administered only to such as are entred into the Ecclesiastical Covenant, explicitly or implicitly: his reason is because the Sacraments are to be administered only *federaliter* i. e. to such as are in Covenant, and so members first.

If M. Norton meaneth by Covenant, the Covenant of grace, it is true, they must be in the Covenant of grace, externally at least, by professed yeelding themselves to the Lord, or by federal holiness, before they be capable of baptism: but then it is nothing to his purpose, but if he mean a particular, Ecclesiastical Covenant, whereby he is made a member of a particular Congregation, then I conceive it is no way requisite unto baptism.

It is against the order of nature that the particular Co- Sect. 2.
venant which is but humane, arbitrary, mutable, extinguishible
and accidental, should precede the general which is divine, ne-
cessary, immutable, perpetual, and essential to a Christian: it
is as if a man should first be made a freeman of *London*, and
then a Denizen of *England*. Indeed he is not capable of the pri-
vileges that are peculiar to that Congregation, except he be
a member of it, but baptism is a general privilege of every
subject of Christs Kingdom. Neither have we any precept in the
Scripture for the precedency of the particular Covenant before
the general: nor any example or intimation of any such practice
in Scripture, but of the contrary. What particular, Congrega-
tional Covenant did those that were baptized by John Baptist,
or Christs Disciples enter into before baptism? or the Eunuch,
the Tylor and his household, or *Lydia*, or *Paul*, or *Cornelius*,
or the 3000. converted by *Peter*, that were inhabitants of so
many several countries? True indeed some of them were mem-
bers of the Jewish Church, and so in the general Covenant, but
what is that to the making of them members of a particular, E-
vangelical Congregational Church? Infants are acknowledged
to be members of the Church before baptism, p. 25. and *Bucer*
Loc. 47. cited for it, yet they enter into no such Covenant
before baptism. *M. Norton* confesseth, p. 25. that the *Protopap-*
ist could not be a member of a Church, unless one man
might be a Church, or a member be without an integral. It is a
marvel that seeing so much weight lyeth on this particular
Church-Covenant, viz. the interest in the seals of the Covenant
of grace, the Scripture should never give any intimation of it, or
directions about it.

The like may be said of hearing the word; any visible belee-
ver may hear it whereever God giveth him opportunity, not
as a heathen, or man without, but as his rightful portion.
And any Christian may joyn in prayer, and say, *Our Father*, &c.
with any Christians in the furthest parts of the world, if he
should come into their company, in the performance of such
duties.

The greatest Query is about the Ordinances of Discipline,
because they cannot be dispensed by a single Elder, but in a
College.

Quest. 2. College or Presbytery of Elders in combination, and require a joynt power to be exercised in the inflicting of censures, and this power it not so facil to be drawn into act as the power to administer Ordinances of worship, which may be by entreaty of any single Minister in any place. But first every one, even as a member of the Church-Catholike, yea, though but entitive, is bound to submit therunto by his entring, by the general Covenant, into the Kingdom of Christ, that being one of his Ordinances, and is needful and beneficial to all Christians.

And every Elder, as he is given to the Church-Catholike, as every *Levite* was to all *Israel*, hath right in *actu primo* to dispense the Ordinances of Discipline every where, if he hath a sufficient call. And in consideration, this Ordinance is given in the same method that the others are, *viz.* first to the whole body and Kingdom of Christ, and secondarily to the particular parts, and yet as in other Ordinances the particular Churches which are last in intention, are first in execution and operation, so it is likewise in this: and so it is in administration of justice in a Kingdom, the Laws are made for the whole Kingdom, and come secondarily to particular Counties and Corporations, are executed primarily and immediatly in those particular Counties and Corporations, and yet this hinders not the power of Parliaments, or Officers called thereto, to dispense justice to divers Counties, yea, to the whole Kingdom, and to relieve such as are wronged in their particular associations.

Suppose an Apostle should have preached in a city, and converted but a few, haply most or all of them women, as it was *Pauls* lot to preach to a company of women, *Act. 16. 13.* so that they could not be brought into an Organical Congregation: could it be conceived that they, though baptized, were still *wisb-ous*? And were not their children *dy-ous*? And if any of them should miscarry in their judgements or practices, had *Paul* nothing to doe to censure them, because they were not congregated and combined by a particular Covenant in a Church-way (as some term it) but remain unfixed members of the Church-Catholike. If they be liable to censure, then doth discipline belong to the Church-Catholike primarily.

Nay, let that be supposed for illustration sake which *Paul* Sect. 2. Gal. 1.8. supposeth of himself, that he or any of the Apostles should have apostatized, and either preached another Messias, or lived scandalously, or proved a persecutour: had Christ left the Church no key to binde him, because he was a general Officer and a fixed member of no particular Congregation? might not the rest of the Apostles excommunicate him? then that censure would be Catholike, without respect to any particular Congregation.

The Ordinances of Discipline were first given to the Church-Catholike, because the keys were first given to the Apostles, who were general Pastours, and therefore the keys are Catholike.

Also the censures past in one Congregation reach the whole Church-Catholike visible, and are binding to the whole, and their absolution reacheth as far, and lets the person into an habitual right to communicate any where again, as hath been shewed before.

That which belongeth to every part of a similar body, that primarily belongs to the whole: but Discipline belongeth to every part of the Church-Catholike which is a similar body: and therefore it primarily belongs to the whole.

If the keys be not Catholike then this inconvenience will follow, that a visible beleever obtaining baptism before he be a fixed member, may either through pretence of scrupulosity, or perigrination, factorship, or frequent removing, or refusal to joyn with any particular Congregation (though never so heretical or scandalous) shall thereby escape all censures, because the keys are only particular, and no body can inflict any censure upon him: and yet being a visible member, under the seal of the covenant, shall converse with other Christians, and haply upon his habitual right, hear the Word, or haply be admitted to the Lords table. Which is as if a Subject of *England*, because he will be a fixed inhabitant in no Town, but wandering up and down, drinking, thieving, and whoring, thereby should escape all civil censures.

It is common to all policies that every County, Corporation,

Quest. 2. or division that have power to administer justice, according to the Lawe of the polity, shall apprehend malefactors within their limits (wherever the malefactor hath his constant dwelling) and either punish them themselves, or turn them over to such as are called to administer justice to the whole: and otherwise outrages cannot be avoided or punished, which are committed by men in places remote from their dwellings.

The like power must be allowed in Christs Ecclesiastical polity, that the visible members of Christs Church may either be censured by the particular Church in whose limits they offend, or be sent to the Church to which they belong, which the offended Church hath no power by civil compulsion to do, or that Church is very far off, haply in another Countrey: or haply they belong to none: or else there must be a combined Eldership that may censure such persons. Though civil limits be appointed for cohabitation of the members of particular Congregations, and for maintenance of their Ministers, and providing for the poor, and are not essential to the Church, but the members are to be accounted as members of that Congregation every where, and the Elders if in travel with any of their Congregation, ought to watch over them and admonish them as their Elders, and they to obey them wherever they become, which sheweth that external limits bound not the Ministerial power, as it doth the civil power of a Mayor or Constable: yet there must be some kinde of proportion holden with civil politicks for the censuring of wandering Christians; else may hereticks and scandalous Christians come from forreign parts, and do much hurt, and yet avoid all censures.

Sett. 3.

Thirdly, *Christs Offices* are first intended for, and executed on the Church Catholike here below. *He is a King, Priest, and Prophet* primarily in respect of the whole, and but secondarily in respect of a particular Congregation or member. Gods aim in redemption was to redeem the whole primarily and secondarily the particulars. *God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Sonne, &c.* i. e. not the Jew only, but the Gentile also: And so in the application of that redemption, as Christ is a Priest he reconcileth and intercedeth for all the elect: as a Prophet

that he teacheth all; as a King he ruleth all primarily, and particular secondarily. So is it also in Christs external Kingdom, as well as his Internal. As an earthly King is indeed King of *Thames* and *John*, &c. but not primarily, but secondarily as they are members of his Kingdom. And the natural head is indeed head to the little finger and toe, but not primarily, but as they are parts of the whole body, whereof it is head: so Christ is a mystical head of the whole Church primarily, and secondarily of the particular parts contained in, and under the whole.

Fourthly, *The signs that difference the true Church from a false*, do not primarily belong to a particular Congregation, but to the Church-Catholike visible, viz. *Profession of the true faith, administration of Gods true Ordinances*, for therein the whole Church agree, and is thereby distinguished from those that are without, not from those that are within. These are no notes to know this or that particular Church by from another, for they are common to the universal Church, they distinguish them not among themselves, but from the general common opposite, the heathen, or the grosse heretick. A man being led into a vault, where were the skulls of many dead men, and understanding that *Alexanders* skull was there, desired his guide to shew him that, his guide told him it was that skull with the hollow eye-holes, and grisly nose, and sutures crossing the brampton, and when the man replied that they had all so, yea, saith his guide, there is no difference between Kings, and other mens skulls, when they are dead. So if any man should ask which is the Church of *Lyons*, *Durham*, &c. it were a folly to say it is the Church where the word of God is preached, and Sacraments administered, and that professe Jesus to be crucified, dead and buried, risen again, and ascended into heaven, &c. for so do all the Church-Catholike, but we must give other notes to distinguish any of them, for these are not *distinctive* because common. That which is *primary* to any thing is *distinctive* to that thing, but that which is *secondary* and common is not *distinctive* from other particulars of the like kinde, or from other parts of a similar integral.

Fifthly, All the members of the particular Churches are members

Qnest. 2.

members of the Church-Catholike, yes, that relation belongs first unto them.

If they be born within the pale of the Church, they have federal holiness, and are *ayids*, not because members of this or that Congregation, but because born of parents within the general, external Covenant, and so within the Church-Catholike. *If they be converted from heathens,* they are not first converted into this or that particular Church, but converted first into the Church-Catholike, and then secondarily admitted members of this or that particular Congregation, after they be baptized. A man may dwell in one City, and hear the word of God by accident in another city, and thereby be converted, but he is not converted to be a member of the Church where he was converted, but into the Church-Catholike. So that *particular Congregations are made up of members of the Catholike*, and therefore most properly in that sense are said to be *Orie*. For such a convert may joyn himself after his conversion to what Congregation he pleaseth to inhabit among. If a man comes into a Parish that is an heathen, he is not a member of that particular Church (though he shall be a civil member of the Town) because he is not a member of the Church-Catholike, but if he be a Christian, then he is a member of that particular Church where he resideth, or fit so to be, and ought not to be denied admission or communion (if no just exception lieth against him) though he had never been a member of any other Congregation. The particular companies in *London* are made up only of free-men that are joyned together in some particular body or society, belonging to such or such a Hall; now the first notion that comes upon any such persons or companies, is, that they are free-men of *London*, and secondarily that they are distinct from other free-men, by being of this or that particular company, belonging to such a Hall. So it is for all Churches: first of all, the members are conceived to be *free of the Church-Catholike*, and secondarily, *distinct by their societies*, in this or that particular Assembly.

And though haply this similitude holdeth not in every thing, as the not removing from one company to another, and being received in there, because he is a free-man; yet it is free for any

any Christ to change his particular relation from one Congregation to another, because he is a Christian, and takes not up his first freedom into a particular Congregation or company, but into the Catholike. They are made members of the whole body and kingdom of Christ, by conversion to the faith, and initiated by the Sacrament of Baptism, but are secondarily made members of a particular Congregation by cohabitation or consociation. He that is free of one Corporation may not thereupon remove to another, and set up his trade as a free man there, because they are constituted by several charters: but the whole Church-Catholike hath but one charter, and by that a Christian is free in any Ecclesiastical Corporation, wherever he please to inhabit, and may not by them be inhibited. As he that was free of Rome was free wherever he became in all the Roman Empire.

Suppose a man had abundance of sheep, as *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, and *Job*, who had 14000. and these sheep had all one brand of the owners upon them, and these sheep were divided into several flocks, under several shepherds, in several sheep-walks, of the same owners, according to his appointment: the primary consideration of any of these sheep or flocks, is not that they are under such a keeper, in such a sheep-walk; but the first consideration of them is, they are such a mans sheep, bearing his brand, and fed by his servants, on his ground, and then the more particular and secondary consideration and notion is, that they are under such a particular shepherd, in such a walk. And the like may be said in a civil respect; the first consideration of a man, is that he is an English man, and so a subject of this kingdom, and the secondary that he is a *Suffolk* man, or an *Ipswich* man. So the first consideration in a spiritual respect of a man, or a Congregation, is, that they are the Lords people, that they belong to Christ, and are his subjects, born, or converted to him, fed, and nourished, and ruled by his Ordinances and Officers, and then the particular secondary notion is, that they are fed and ruled by such Elders, in such a place or society.

It is an usual similitude on all hands to compare the Church to the Sea or Ocean; which though it be one, yet as it walbeth upon

Quest. 2. upon this or that Countrey, receiveth the name and distinction of the *German, Spanish, Irish, or British Seas*. And so when it puts in at any creek, because it is continuous with the Sea, we call it the Sea. And we say the sea comes up at *Harrowish, Ipswich, Mundree, Colchester*; now it were absurd for any man to think that the particular Seas were the prime Seas, and the main is *Mare fœderatum oceanum*, Or because the name Sea is indulged to this or that arm or Creek, that therefore that should monopolize the name Sea to it self, that there should be no Sea, but such Creeks, or that any such Creeks should arrogate the name and priviledges of the Sea, first, to themselves, and leave them but secondarily to the main. So it is for particular Congregations, which have the name and priviledges of the Church indulged to them at second or third hand (because they are members and similar parts of the whole) to usurp and challenge the name and priviledges given by God to the Church-Catholike, primarily to themselves, and leave them secondarily to the Church-Catholike.

3^d. 4. Sixthly, *The Ministers are primarily Ministers of the Church-Catholike, secondarily of this or that particular flock or Congregation; and therefore the Catholike is the prime Church*. And this appears thus, *That Church to which the donation of the Ministry was first made, is the first subject thereof: but that was the Church-Catholike*. Therefore, &c.

For proof hereof see *Mat. 28. 19.* and *1 Cor. 12. 28, 29.* God hath set some in the Church, first *Apostles*, secondarily *Prophets*, thirdly *Teachers*. Now this Church was the Church-Catholike, and not any particular Congregation, for it is the Church to which God gave Apostles. Note also from hence, that the same Church to which God gave Apostles and Prophets, to the same he gave Teachers also: though not with general, actual power, as to the extraordinary Officers, yet with habitual power of office. And although *Bishop, Pastor, Elder and Minister* doe carry a reference to some particular place wherein by the polity of the Church such Officers are set; yet have they a more general relation extending to the whole Church-Catholike, as hath been shewed before.

For an Apostle calls himself a *Teacher and Preacher*, 2 Tim.

1.11. Peter also and John the Apostles call themselves *Presby-* Sect. 4.
ters, 1 Pet. 5.1. 2 Ep. Joh. 1. and 3 Ep. Joh. 1. We finde also Mi-
 nisters are in Scripture spoken of under a general notion. They
 are called *Ministers of the Word*, Luk. 1.2. and *Ministers of God*,
 2 Cor. 6.4. and *Ministers of Christ*, 1 Cor. 4.1. and *Ministers*
of the New Testament, 2 Cor. 3.6. and *Ministers of the Gospel*,
 1 Thes. 3.2. and *Ministers of the Lord*, Ephes. 6.21. Where the
 Ministerial Office is set down by the reference thereof to the
Author that employeth them, and the *subject* about which
 they are employed, and not the object persons, unto whom
 they ministered. They are not called *Ministers of the people*, as if
 they carried their keys, and were their stewards, but their Teach-
 ers, Rulers, Pastors, Overseers, Fathers or *Ministers for them*,
 Col. 1.7. Indeed the Apostle saith, they are your servants for
 Christs sake, 2 Cor. 4.5. As the Gentlemen that serve a Noble
 man, serve the meanest that are invited to his table, but therein
 they do service to their Lord.

And the Angels themselves (by whose names Ministers are
 called in 2. and 3. of *Revelation*) they are ministering spirits sent
 out for the good of the Elect, but it is in subjection and obedi-
 ence to God, and not to them.

And if a Minister of this or that Congregation be not a Mini-
 ster of the Church-Catholike visible, then he is no Minister out of
 his own Congregation, and therefore cannot preach or administer any
 Sacraments as a Minister, out of his own Congregation, yea, if any
 members of another Congregation should come and hear a Mi-
 nister preach in his own Congregation, he could not preach to
 them, nor they hear him as a Minister but only as a gifted bro-
 ther. And though he may pray and beseech his own flock as an
 Ambassadors of Christ, to be reconciled unto God, 2 Cor. 5.20.
 yet he cannot say so to any other, except he be an Ambassadors
 in office unto others also. And if he be a Minister to one member
 besides his own Congregation, then is he so indefinitely to all, by
 the same reason.

But if he deliver the word as a Minister to his own Congre-
 gation only, then the same word which is delivered at the same
 time by the same man, is delivered by vertue of the Ministerial
 office to some, and to others *ex officio charitatis generali*, only
 2 as

Quest. 2. as a gifted brother. And if this be granted, which is absurd, yet a greater absurdity will follow, *viz.* that if he administer the Lords Supper to any members of another Congregation, he must do that also as a gifted brother, and as a private person; whereas a private person out of office, hath nothing to doe to administer the seals of the Covenant, as is confessed by all, except a few Anabaptists of late on purpose, as I conceive, to avoid this argument. And yet this communion of members of other Congregations is frequent among our brethren for Congregational Churches. Neither can this be answered that it is done by virtue of communion of Churches, except there be a communion of offices and Officers, and so every Minister be an indefinite, habitual Officer, and a Minister of the Church-Catholike.

And if a Minister hath an indefinite office, and can administer the seals of the Covenant, to strangers in his own Congregation, in his own meeting-house, then any where else, in any other meeting-house; for no man will say his Ministerial office is circumscribed by, or tyed unto the fabrick of his own meeting-house, or any especial influence or authority afforded him in the execution of his Ministerial function by the presence of his own Congregation. He whose office is limited within, and stands wholly in relation to a particular place, is out of office when he is out of that place, as a Mayor of a Corporation, and a Constable of a Parish: but so is not a Minister, he is no private man as soon as he is out of his meeting-house, or the limits of his Congregation.

And though indeed he be more peculiarly their Pastour or Bishop, one that hath the oversight of them in the Lord, in a more immediate, especial manner actually, yet this extends to all places, wherever he or they shall come by occasion, though never so far from their dwellings, but so is not a Mayor or Constable. And besides this particular relation he hath an indefinite office, he is a Minister in general to all others, and may exert his power of office to them, as God giveth occasion, and they give him a call, without taking a new especial relation to them: but so cannot a Mayor or Constable, though they were entreated to use their office out of their limits, because they are onely particular Officers. See this more fully in *Chap. 6. Sect. 4. and 5.*

Suppose

Suppose a Ministers flock by mortality, or the sword should be dissolved, extinct and cease, indeed he ceaseth to be their Pastor, because the correlative faileth, but he ceaseth not to be a Minister of the Gospel. A King or Mayor haply cease to be so any longer, if his Kingdom or Corporation should sink or be swallowed up, because there is no Catholike Kingdom or Corporation whereof they were Officers, but the office of the Minister ceaseth not, because he was an Officer of the Church-Catholike, which correlative sinketh not: but still his power *in actu primo* to dispense all the Ordinances of Christ, which a single Officer can perform, remaineth, only his call *ad actum secundum sive exercitium, pro hic & nunc*, which is appointed by the polity of the Church for order, ceaseth, because they are cut off that gave him a call thereto.

An Objection against this I finde made by those two Reverend Ministers M. A. and M. S. in their *Defence*, p. 208. It is to this purpose. If Ordination of a Minister be an indeleble character (like Baptism) and ceaseth not when his particular relation to a Congregation ceaseth, why then should not a ruling-Elder or Deacon remain an Elder or Deacon in the Church, though their particular relations cease?

Ans. 1. If you please to cast your eye back to the answer of an Objection of M. Hookers that is like to this, *Ch. 2. Sect. 4.* it may afford some light to the answering of this Objection, to which I referre you, being loth to repeat the same again.

2. I premise also, that for ought I can finde, both ruling-Elders and Deacons, should continue in their offices as long as they lived, if the Congregations or Presbyterial Churches which chose them be not dissolved, or if they be not ejected by censure.

3. I deny not but that the Deacons office may cease at the dissolution of the Church that chose them, because the subject of their office, *viz.* contributions, cease with the contributors: and so it may be said of the ruling Elders also, because the particular object of their office ceaseth; and yet both of them while they are in their offices may extend the execution of their offices beyond the particular Church that chose them, to a greater

Quest. 2. part of the Church, and possibly to the whole.

4. There is a great difference between the Minister of the word and the ruling-Elder, the first hath two keys, *viz.* of doctrine and discipline, the other hath but one, *viz.* of discipline. The superiour order is conceived to comprehend the power of the inferiour; and so the Apostles had all the power of the inferiour, even of Deacons; the like may be said of the rest.

5. The key of discipline cannot be exercised but in a combination, and therefore must cease when that ceaseth, which must be at the dissolution of the particular Church, whether Congregational or Presbyterial which chose them: but the key of doctrine, with which the Minister of the word is invested, may be exercised by a single person out of combination, and therefore that ceaseth not at such dissolution. Indeed the exercise of his key of discipline is suspended by such dissolution, yet is reserved in him habitually *in actu primo*, because it is annexed to (if not comprehended under) his key of doctrine. And if there can be any use made of that position of dispensing Ordinances to other Churches *mediantibus candelabris*, it is more proper to this key then the other, because his particular relation to the particular Church lets him into the particular combination, and so into a greater upon occasion of a call.

6. And for ought I know this might be the reason why the Apostle changed the manner of speech from the concrete to the abstract, 1 Cor. 12. 28. from teachers to helps, governments; to intimate that they that have those offices cease to be Officers when they cease to be helps, or to be employed in government, but the others are affixed indeleibly unto their persons, and may be exercised more at large in the Church, and out of it, *ἐκκλησιαστικῶς*, and singly without actual combination.

Suppose a part of a County wherein a Justice of peace formerly dwelt, and executed his office, should sink, yet, if he be preserved, he remaineth still in his office, and may execute it in any other place in the County, where he shall dwell, because his office stood in reference to the whole County, though he exercised it actually but in one place. So is the Ministers office (as a Minister of the Gospel) general, though they take

take but particular divisions and parcels of the Church to feed and watch over actually and particularly, and do not ordinarily stretch themselves within anothers particular line and limits without a call, by permittance, or entreaty, or combination. Sect. 4.

And that a Minister is a Minister of the Church Catholike visible, appears thus. *He that can ministerially admit or eject a member into, or out of the Church-Catholike visible, is a Minister and Officer of the Church-Catholike visible, But every Minister by Baptism, or Excommunication admitteth or ejecteth members into, or out of the Church-Catholike visible. Therefore, &c.*

This Argument I finde more fully laid down by Apollonius, *"Pastor ut Pastor exercet multos actus ministeriales, non tantum
"erga Ecclesiam suam particularem cui ordinario ministerio est
"affixus, sed erga Ecclesias alias particulares, & Provinciales,
" & Nationales, imò & erga Ecclesiam universalem: Nam per
" Baptismum membra in Ecclesiam universalem admittit: per ex-
" communicationem membra, non tantum ex sua particulari, sed
" etiam Provinciali, Nationali, & Universali Ecclesia ejicit,
" Matth. 18. 18, 19. Ex officio pastorali preces Deo offert pro
" omnibus alijs Ecclesijs laborantibus: verbum Dei in alia Ec-
" clesia particulari predicare potest, non tantum virtute & rati-
" one donorum, sed cum pastoralis auctoritate, ita ut verbo suo
" liget, & solvat peccatores, remittat & retineat peccata, & ut
" legatus missus a Deo obsecret homines ut reconcilientur Deo.*

Of excommunication I spake before, proving that it ejecteth a man from communion with the whole Church-Catholike visible.

This M. Ellis saith is not formally but virtually done. But I answer, then it will follow that by Baptism they are not formally admitted into the Church-Catholike, but virtually. But into what Church were they baptized that were baptized by John Baptist and the Apostles, before particular Congregations were constituted? And now they are constituted, it cannot be said they are formally baptized into them, for haply the person baptized in a particular Congregation, will never be a member thereof, but of some other. Our brethren hold that it is entering

Quest. 2. into their particular Covenant, that makes them actually members of their Congregation, and that the children of their own Church-members are by baptism but incompleat members of that Congregation.

Our brethren will not say (I suppose) that those persons that go from hence to them, being already baptized, are heathens and without, though they have lost their particular membership? Surely they account them subjects of Christ, and under his seal; why else doe they admit any of them members of their Congregations (into which they may admit only Christs Subjects) and set no new seal of Baptism upon them?

And as Baptism admitteth *primally, formally, and antecedenter* into the Church-Catholike, and *secondarily and consequenter* into that particular Congregation, so the same order is in ejection by excommunication. If a finger were added to a mans hand, the primary consideration is, that there is a limb given to that man, such a man we say hath recovered his sight or hearing, though it be seated in the eye or ear.

And if a hand could be conceived to cut, nip, or sear off a gangreened finger, it would not be conceived as an act of the hand only, but as an act of the man, and the man would be said to loose a limb primarily, and the secondary consideration is, that the particular hand hath lost a finger. When D. *Cranmer* burnt off his right hand, it was not the act of the arm only, but of the whole man primarily. And if this be so of members that are fixed, and have their particular place and office in the body, and cannot be removed and set any where else: then much more of the members of the Church, which were members of the Church-Entitive, before they received their particular membership in any Congregation, and may be removed from one Congregation to another, as oft as occasion or conveniency serveth.

But because excommunication is an act of many, *ἐκ τῶν πλείονων*, 1 Cor. 3. 6. I will therefore insist more particularly upon Baptism, which is an act of a single Pastor or Minister, though passed with the knowledge and consent of the Congregation.

That by Baptism we are admitted into the Church, I think Sect. 4. is without doubt: for if persons baptized be not members of the visible Church, then the seal of the Covenant is administered to those that are and remainers of the Church, and so were no initial seal, which were absurd to say.

M. Ball in his Catechism hath this passage. "Baptism is a Sacrament of our ingrafting into Christ, communion with him, and entrance into the Church, for which he citeth, *Mat* 28. 19. *Act* 8. 38. And afterwards explains himself. It doth (saith he) solemnly signifie and seal their ingrafting into Christ, and confirmeth that they are acknowledged members of the Church, and entered into it.

And that we are thereby admitted members, not of a particular Congregation but the Church-Catholike, appears, because we are baptized into one body, *1 Cor*. 12. 13. And this appears further, because he that is baptized in one Congregation, is baptized all over the world, and is not to be re-baptized, but is taken as a member of the Church wherever he becomes. See before Chap. 6. Now that baptizing is an act of office, appears, *Joh*. 1. 33. He that sent me to baptize. And Go teach all Nations, and baptize them, &c. *Mat*. 28. was the substance of the Apostles Commission. And though *Paul* *1 Cor*. 1. 17. saith, Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the Gospel, yet that is meant not principally, for he was sent also to baptize, else he might not have done it, which we read he did.

And that by an act of this office we are baptized into the Church-Catholike, appears, because *John Baptist* baptized all *Jerusalem*, *Judea*, and all the region round about *Jordan*. And the Disciples of Christ made and baptized more Disciples then *John*, and that without any relation to any particular Congregations; which had it been necessary, or had baptism been ordained in reference to particular Congregations, they could have combined them into. So *Peter* caused *Cornelius* and his friends to be baptized, *Act*. 10. 48. but no mention is made of any Congregation into which they were baptized. And *Philip* baptized the *Eunuch* but not into any particular Congregation. Into what Congregation did *Ananias* baptize *Paul*, *Act*. 9. 18. ? Or how can it appear that *Ananias* was an Evangelist, or any extraordinary

Quest. 2. ordinary Officer? he is called a Disciple at *Damascus*, it is probable he was one of the Elders there, but that *Paul* was ever a fixed member of any particular Congregation, it appears not.

That which is answered to this is, that they which administered Baptism so indefinitely, were extraordinary general Officers, which are now ceased. But this saves it not, for if the immediate right to Baptism, &c. comes to the receiver by being a member of a particular instituted Congregation, as *M. Noram*, and *M. A.* and *M. S.* in *Def. Ch. 4.* pag. 73. tells us, then *John Baptist*, *Christ's Disciples*, *Philip* and *Ananias* (though he had been an Evangelist) administered it to such as had no actual and immediate right to receive it. Indeed the answer implyeth a more large, actual, extensive power in the administrators, either to have constituted new Churches, or to administer in any constituted Churches, but it gives not them power to administer any Ordinance of God to such as had no right thereto, nor power to the receivers to receive it without actual right, in an undue order. It gives them not *in iure*, who had in themselves only *in ad rem*, as their distinction is. And the proof brought p. 76. out of *Act. 5. 14.* is, as I conceive, mistaken. Their words are these. "Believers were added, first, they were beleevers standing in that spiritual relation to Christ and his whole body, "and then added to the Church by visible combination. But it is not said they were added to the Church, but added to the Lord: and it were incongruous to gather thence, that they were first beleevers, and after that were added to the Lord by a second act, seeing their adding to the Lord was by beleeving, and that which added them to the Lord the head and King added them to the body and Kingdom.

"And whereas they say, that Justification and Adoption, &c. flow immediatly from internal union with Christ, but instituted Ordinances and Priviledges mediately, and in such an order as Christ hath in wisdom ordained, and the nature of visible government and Ordinances of Christ necessarily require, p. 76. If they mean by it, being members of particular Congregations: then would I know whether hearing the word publicly preached or read, or joyning in publicke singing, or
in

in keeping a day of publike thanksgiving, or fasting, or making Sect. 4.
vows, or taking oaths, which are instituted Ordinances, may
not be permitted to any but such as are members of particular
Congregations?

The Apostles carried about one with them whom they
called *ministri* a Minister, *Act. 13. 5.* who was no Apostle, and
he baptized for them into the Church-Catholike, and when
a sufficient number were converted and baptized, then fol-
lowed the particular relation of a particular Congregati-
on, by ordaining Officers to take the particular care over
them.

So *Tychicus Col. 4. 7.* is called a *beloved brother and faithful
Ministor, and fellow-servant in the Lord.* And *Eph. 6. 21.* he
hath the same stile given him. Certainly he could not be a pe-
culiar Minister to both those distant Churches: and haply he
was so to neither of them, if we may give any credit to *Do-
rotheus*, who saith he was Bishop of *Chalcedon* in *Bithynia.*
Apollos baptized at *Corinth*, *1 Cor. 3. 4.* and yet was no Apostle
but a Minister and steward of the mysteries of God as well as
they at *Cor. 4. 1.* Hence is that distinction of *Ambrosius* in his *Ani-
madversions* on *Bellarmin. c. 7. not. 7.* *Alia est ecclesia sive universa
communis, quâ vir bonus, pius, doctus, opus, absolute eligitur ad
ministerium verbi apostolicum: alia particularis sive singularis,
quâ ad ministerium singulariter huic vel illi Ecclesie praeferendus
eligitur, id est, ad ministerium particularis Ecclesie.*

And the Scripture alwaies calling the beleivers in one city,
one Church, even *Ierusalem*, though there were many thou-
sands, yea myriads, i. e. many ten thousands of beleiving Jews
therein, as *James* tells *Paul*, *Act. 21. 20.* *non parvulus*, which
were all probably of *Ierusalem*, as appears, first, because they
were not such as could bear any witness against *Paul*, but by
hearsay, *they are informed of thee.* But the Jews dispersed amongst
the Gentiles, having seen and heard *Paul*, could have testified
of their own knowledge, and would not be blinded with *Pauls* pre-
sent conformity. And secondly, because they only of *Ierusalem*
could receive satisfaction by *Pauls* conformity to the Law at *Ie-
rusalem* at that time, and not the others.

Also the holy Ghost calling the Elders of those cities, the
Elders

Quest. 2. Elders of the Church *in communi*, it leaveth it uncertain to me whether the several Elders were fixed over the particular Congregations, or taught and ruled *in communi*, as the Ministers do now in *Middleburgh*, and *Strasburgh*, and other places: yet because it maketh most for edification and order, to have them fixed, I shall think they were, until the contrary shall be proved; but however they ruled in common in the exercise of discipline, which is the Ordinance which our brethren are most unwilling to grant should be exercised out of the particular Congregation.

Self. 5. Seventhly, *That Church to which every Christian first bears relation, and which relation continueth last, and cannot be broken by him without sin, is the first Church, but such is the Church-Catholike visible.* Therefore, &c.

The major is undeniable, The minor appears, because none can be admitted into a particular Congregation, except he be judged first of the Church-Catholike, and that not merely Entitive, but under the seal of the Covenant administred by some Officer, and so stands bound to submit himself to all Christs Ordinances and Officers, by one of which he receives his admission. So again, though he change his habitation never so often, bear relation to never so many particular Congregations one after another, yet in all those the general relation holdeth stil: he is still a baptized visible member of the Church-Catholike, and therefore to be received wherever he cometh into any particular Congregation. Yea, in the *interim* after his breaking off from one Congregation, and placing in another, he retains the general relation and baptism, and is not an heathen or infidel, he is not one *without* in the Apostles phrase.

Yea, suppose a man should be a Traveller, Merchant, or Factor, and settled in no particular Congregation, yet being a Christian, he is a member of the Church-Catholike: yea, and if he broach any errours, or live inordinately, he shall be accountable to the Church where he for the present resides, or such crimes are committed, and liable to their censure, as being a member of the Church-Catholike. And this appears, because the Church of *Ephesus* is commended, *Rev. 2. 2.* for trying strangers that came among them under the notion of Apostles, and found

found them lyars, and so would not receive them. And our Sect. 5. brethren undertake to inflict the sentence of Non-communion (for so they call it a sentence of Non-communion denounced. *Apollog. Nar.* pag. 18. and 19.) against strangers, yea, whole Churches: but how it will stand with some other principles of theirs, I know not: if it be a sentence denounced, it is a censure, and so an act of discipline exercised against those out of their particular confederation; which in my apprehension is but changing an old warranted censure of the Church, into a new and doubtful one: but both seem to agree in the general nature of a sentence or censure.

Surely hereticks and false teachers are not to be left to the Magistrate only, but to be referred to Ecclesiastical trial: for those things come not under the cognizance of the civil Magistrate properly: or he may be an heathen, and will not regard an heretick, nor can judge of him, *Act. 18. 15.*

And if every kingdom will try murther, treason, or any foul crime committed in the same, though by a stranger or alien, because the crimes are against their laws and sovereign, though their Laws pertain not to the countrey where the forreigner was born and dwelleth: then much more shall every Church try those members of the Church-Catholike, residing among them, for their crimes or false doctrines, seeing they have all the same sovereign head, the same Laws, and are all one habitual body.

Again, It is no sinne for a man to remove from one Congregation to another, as oft as occasion or conveniency require, but for a man to remove out of the Church-Catholike, either Entirely by disclaiming the doctrine and faith of Christ, or organical by refusing to joyn to any Christian society, or to be under, and submit unto any Church-discipline, is a great sinne and apostacy. No man is accounted a schismatick for removing from one Congregation to another, but he that shall separate himself from all Church-communion, and shall rend himself from the Church-Catholike, he is a schismatick, he is an Apostate. And therefore the several sects though they pretend, because of wants or blemishes to rend from the Church of *England* or *Scotland*, &c. yet not from the Church-Catholike by no means, because they know that

Quest. 2.

Rightly, That Church from which the particular Churches spring, and to which they are as an additament and increase, that is the prime Church, but that is the Church-Catholike. Therefore, &c.

The major is clear of it self, The minor appears, because they are the instrument to convert the rest, and bring them into the same kingdom of Christ with themselves, *Act. 2.47.* God added to the Church daily such as should be saved. That little handful to which the Catholike charter was first given, leavened the whole world, and brought them in as an addition to themselves. They were to be witnesses in Jerusalem, and then in Judaea, and to the ends of the earth, *Act. 1.8.* For the Law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, *Isa. 2.3.* The Lord shall send the rod of his strength out of Zion, *Psalm 110.2.* It was with the Church then as was said of the river of Eden, *Gen. 2.10.* A river went out of Eden to water the garden, and from thence it was parted into four heads. So the water of life flowed from Zion into the four quarters of the world.

As there is no creek but hath its rise from, and continuity with the Main, and receives influence from it: so there is no particular Church but hath his first rise, and ministerial influence from the Church-Catholike, and received the Gospel and privileges of it from thence ministerially. God calls no Evangelical Churches by inspiration only, but by the ministry of those that are members of the Church-Catholike, or some part of it. God would not have *Cornelius* instructed by an Angel, though he could have done it, but by *Peter* a Minister of the Church-Evangelical: and likewise the *Eunuch* by *Philip*.

So that the Church-Catholike is as the Sea, and particular Churches as so many creeks or arms receiving a tincture and season of her waters. The Church-Catholike is as the tree, Christ as the root, the particular Churches as branches, as *Cyprian* makes the comparison. Shee is the mother, and they as daughters; born of her, and receiving from her ministerially both nature and privilege. *John 1.12.*

Paul indeed was called extraordinarily from heaven by Christ himself, the head of the Church (and not by an Angel) that he might be, as some conceive, a type of the second call of the

Jews, who (as some hold) shall be so called, as he was, by the Sect. 5.
appearing of the sign of the Son of man: and therefore that Church
 is said to come down from God out of heaven, *Rev. 21. 2, 10.*
 And the ground of this type they take from *1 Tim. 1. 16.* For
this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might
show forth all long-sufferance for a pattern, *πρὸς ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν μελ-*
λόντων μέλειν ἐν αὐτῷ, *to them that should or shall hereafter believe*
on him.

But these things are mysteries, and I dare not be too confident in them, yet should they come to passe, they infringe not this truth, because their conversion shall come from the head, root, and fountain it self of the Church; as *Abrahams* call was. And no question but Christ did convert many in the daies of his flesh, when he was actually and visibly a member of the Church here below. And if any be converted by secret inspiration or revelation, and neither converted nor fed by any external Ordinances, as haply some infants of heathens or any Philosophers, as *Plato* (if haply there were any so converted) they are not to be reckoned of the visible Church, and so not belonging to this question.

There is a double rise of the particular Churches out of the general.

First, All Congregations are made up of the members of the Church Entitive, or of persons that are visible beleevers, and their children, which are holy, being born in the Covenant.

Secondly, Consider the Church Catholike as Christs Kingdom or Corporation, already invested with Evangelical Ordinances and Priviledges, and it affords a twofold rise to those that are added to them.

First, They are instrumental by their preaching, godly conversation, and sometimes by their sufferings, to convert those that are aliens from the Common-wealth of Israel.

Secondly, They give them ministerially their admittance, entrance, and as I may say freedom in the Church, both as private members, and if any of them be ordained Officers, it is by such as are Officers before, and not *quā* Officers of the particular Churches (for it is an extrinsecal act to them as so con-

Quest. 2.

sidered) but of the general. And in the erecting of a new Congregation in *New-England*, there is to be the consent, advice, and help, of the Elders of neighbour-Churches; they are not only to allow thereof, but also to ordain them Elders, which cannot be an act of particular Officers, for it is no act toward their own flocks, it is extraneous to them: but it is as they are are habitually general Officers, and this occasion draws forth their power for the good and encrease of the whole.

Sect. 6.

If it be asked What is sufficient to make a man a member of the visible Church? I answer, knowledge and belief of the main points of the Christian faith, and professed subjection thereunto. And this is as much as the Apostles required, as in the case of the *Eunuch* and *Simon Magus*, &c. and if it were sufficient then, it is so still: for those were the purest Churches erected by infallible men: and yet they went upon no other grounds. *So many gladly received the word were baptized*, Act 2 41. And yet this is no more then may be found in an hypocrite, out of novelty, sudden flashes, admiration at the extraordinary gifts and miracles: and was found in the stony ground which received the word with joy. And we have no other rule to go by in gathering Churches, or receiving members into a Church, then they had, neither may we presume to make any other.

Sic omnes fide Reformati; Theologi celebres materiam visibilibus Ecclesia afferunt esse homines externè vocatos fidem Christi professentes: namque designant eorum hominum vocatione externa seu predicatione verbi & Sacramentorum communicatione advocatorum ad cultum Dei & societatem Ecclesiasticam inter se celebrandam, Apol. p. 8. Vide etiam utrumque Trilegium in locis com. Loc. de Ecclesia, & Professores Leidenses, Disp. 40. Thes. 3.

It is true, God commands true piety: and no man shall see Gods face in blisse, nor be of the invisible company without it. But I speak what is requisite in *visibile Ecclesia*; and what matter must be for a visible Church, and then I conceive it is not absolutely requisite that the persons should be truly godly to make them members thereof. For if it were otherwise, no man could

tell when he is in a true Church, or who are true members, or Sect. 6. whose childe ought to be baptized. And if the living members of Christ were the only or essential members of a visible Church, then none are true essential members but they: and a truly godly Minister is a more essential Minister than another, and the Ordinances administered by him, are more essentially administered than by another: and then the vertue of the Ordinance should depend not on Christs Institution, but on the worthinesse of the person administering. And haply after many years living under a Minister that seemed godly, that Minister by falling away shews himself that he was not so, and then all those Ordinances were null, being administered by one that was not only no Minister, but no true member of the Church. I therefore conclude with that saying of Ames in his *Bellarm. Enervat. Falsum est internas virtutes requiri a nobis ut aliquis sit in Ecclesia quoad visibilem ejus statum.*

And this M. Norton in *Resp. ad Apollon. p. 3.* acknowledgeth, *Potest aliquis in externa Ecclesia communionem admitti, qui reali sanctitate regenerationis, & justificante fide non est praeditus, seu qui rigido examine exploratus, signa vera fidei, & sanctitatis interna reali tam evidentia non dederit, qua omnem conscientiam hominum convincere possint de sincerâ ejus fide, &c. Neque necessarium quarendum, an articulatum possint demonstrare evidentia vera gratiae salutaris tenuitatem, &c.* but only they must be *fideles* *κατὰ ὁμολογίαν*, & *ὁμολογῆσαι*, as he expresth himself in divers places, they must be *Ecclesiastice fideles*, & *apparenter*, &c. *non semper κατὰ ἀληθειαν*, pag. 11. *In casibus Ecclesiasticis Judas revera non fidelis, is a estimandus a co-Apostolis, ut se gerant erga illum ac si esset fidelis*, p. 12.

There may be a holinesse of dedication and consecration, where there is no true holinesse of regeneration and sanctification.

Objeſt. But holinesse of dedication and consecration is founded upon holinesse of sanctification, at least supposed, and therefore all the Church-members ought to have supposed sanctification.

Anſw. That sanctification is commanded by God to every one that will dedicate himself unto God, is clear. But for the

supposition

Quest. 21.

supposition of it in all, it will be hard to prove. God enjoyed his people of *Israel* to consecrate themselves unto him to be his people, yet he did not suppose them all to be godly: for he expresseth the contrary of them; neither did *Moses* and *Aaron* suppose so of them, nor the Prophets, for they expresse the quite contrary.

And if we come to the New Testament, it cannot be conceived that *Iohn Baptist*, or Christs Apostles did in their personal judgements apprehend all those to be truly godly whom they baptized and dedicated to God. For *Iohn* called the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* a generation of vipers, and yet addeth, *I indeed baptize you with water*, *Match.* 3.7,11. Indeed they confessed their sins, and it is like promised amendment, and so will the worst in our Congregations doe, though they never perform it. The ground therefore upon which this supposal is to be, must not be any mans personal particular judgement, built upon such evidence as may convince the understanding of a judicious, experienced Minister or Christian, that the persons are truly godly, but an Ecclesiastical judgement *in foro Ecclesia* raised upon such grounds as the Ministers of God directed by God have formerly gone upon; which conditions if they finde they are not to deny administration of the seals unto, which are the seals of the visible not invisible Church. The same causes and rules are of admission that are of ejection *vice versa*: and as no man is to be censured and cast out of the visible Church, because the Elders particular judgement makes them think the man hath not the true power of godlinesse, and grace of God in sincerity, except he commit that which deserves an Ecclesiastical censure: so neither is admission to be denied to any man that desires to dedicate himself unto God, and will promise and professe subjection to Christ in all his Ordinances, though it be suspected by judicious Christians, that he hath not the true work of grace in his heart. The Church of God in their Ecclesiastical judgement censureth only ignorance, error and scandal. A Scholar that is admitted into a school, is not admitted because he is *doctus*, but *ut sit doctus*, and if he will submit to the rules of the school, and apply himself to learn, it is enough for his admission: the like may be said of

the Church visible which is Christs school. *John Baptift* did not Sect. 6.
in his conscience think they had all actually, really and compleatly
repented and reformed themselves whom he baptized, but he *bap-*
tized them unto repentance, Mat. 3. 11. and they by receiving the
same bound themselves to endeavour the practice thereof. It
were a sad case for Ministers if they were bound to admit none,
or administer the Lords Supper to none, but such as were truly
godly, or that they judged in their conscience to be so, or were
bound to eject all that they judged were not so. I fear the Elders
in *New-England* do not in their consciences judge so of all their
members. It is not confederation that can give right to Ordi-
nances, if by Gods laws they ought not to have them.

There is a great difference between the visible and invisible
Church: the rules of the one will not serve for the other.
No Minister could ever administer the Sacrament without sin,
if he ought not to administer it to any but such as are truly
godly: neither hath God given us any rules to judge certain-
ly of the truth of grace in any man: but the most judicious
Divine in the world may be deceived by a cunning hypocrite:
And to save this by saying we ought to think in our consci-
ence that they are godly, is vain; for as we have no such rule
to go by it is word: so it is very harsh to passe an Eccle-
siastical censure upon that ground, and the like may be said
of denying admission thereupon; and it is also a very doubt-
ful rule for a Minister to go by, for some men judge very well
of him that others judge but slightly of; and there will be a
division among people in their communicating together ac-
cording to their several judgements one of another, till sus-
pecting that they have fellowship with unbelievers: and both
Ministers and peoples judgement vary very much concerning
the same man; according to the variety of his carriage there
will sometimes be hopes and sometimes fears: but Ecclesiasti-
cal judgement is not guided by such uncertain, variable rules,
neither in admission nor ejection, but upon clear evidence and
palpable grounds, which must reach all, and may be clearly
known and proved.

There are some I finde that distinguish between the quali-
fications of the members of the Church-Catholike visible, and
of

Quest. 2. of the members of particular instituted Churches. For the former, *viz.* the general membership, they acknowledge that these forenamed qualifications will be sufficient; and therefore will admit such and their children to baptism, which (say they) is an Ordinance of the Church-Catholike visible: and every Minister being a Minister of the Church-Catholike visible (besides his particular relation to his particular Congregation) may, say they, administer baptism to them, though they be members of no instituted Churches: but to make a member of a particular instituted Congregation, they require evident signs of true grace, and a consent and submission to the Ordinances of Discipline dispensed by the particular Officers. But this distinction of qualifications I finde not grounded upon the word of God, nor that any should be fit to be members of the Church-Catholike visible, and not to be members of a particular visible Congregation. If they be brought into Christs sheep-fold, they are fit to have some of Christs shepheards to take inspection of them: if they be admitted into Christs Kingdom, City, Family, they are fit to be under the regiment of some of his Officers. If the Ordinances of worship, yea, the seal of the Covenant be administred to them, I see no ground that these should be freed from the Ordinances of Discipline, who in all likelihood will stand in most need thereof.

The great Objection which M. Hooker urgeth against this assertion, that the particular Churches are *orta*, and whereby he would prove the Church-Catholike to be *Orta*, is because if the Church-Catholike be an integral, it is made up of the aggregation of the particulars, & *oritur ex illis*: And every *Integrum* is in respect of the parts *Symbolum effecti*. And the parts must have a being before the whole can result out of them.

Ans. My main intention in the Question was to prove the Church-Catholike to be the prime Church in those respects which are enumerated in the explication of this part of the predicate of the Question, to which I referre you: and that the particular Churches are secondary in the same senses also.

And for the particular Churches being *Orta*, I have already

both in the explication of the terms of the Question, *Chap. I. Sect. 6. Sect. 4.* and in this second part expressed my meaning thereof. *Sect. I. &c.*

My meaning is not in regard of the aggregation and combination of the particular Churches to make one aggregated, combined integral: for so indeed the Church-Catholike puts on the notion of *orm*. But I meant it first in regard the particular Congregations are made up of, and arise out of the members of the Church-Entitive or of visible beleivers, which are the matter thereof. And whereas it is objected against this, that that Church is no political body: haply never had the sight or knowledge one of another, never entred into agreement of government one with another: and are wholly destitute, according to reason, and all rules of the Gospel, of all Church-priviledges, *Sarrv. p. 287.* I answer, the Church indeed so considered is no actual polity, yet it is an integral, and it is visible in regard of the persons, covenant, laws, and profession. As all the subjects of the Kingdom of *England* are an integral in reference to the King and Laws, though they should for a time want inferiour Officers. And though they be not in particular combinations, and so are destitute of the particular priviledges, and have no particular Officers to dispense Gods Ordinances to them constantly, yet have they right by reason and Scripture rules to all the Ordinances of God, as well as baptism, and they covenant to submit to all Gods Ordinances, even those of discipline: and are habitually under the habitual power of the Ministers office, and are capable of censures, as hath been shewed before: only they want the opportunity of enjoying them constantly by particular Officers of their own. The right of an English man to the priviledges of the Laws, doth not arise by being actually under such and such particular Officers in a Corporation, &c. but by being members of the Kingdom. So is the right of visible beleivers to Church-priviledges, by being Christs visible subjects.

Secondly, the particular converts are brought into Christs Kingdom by the Church-Catholike visible already in being: and spiritually conquered and subdued by them to Christ: they are the fruits and successe of their Ministry, as Orga-

Quest. 2.

nical. Christs Ministers are their spiritual fathers, and they are children born to the Church, and are added to the Church.

Thirdly, The Church doth initiate them, and ministerially convey the priviledges to the converts, by enrowling them as free-men of the Church by baptism, and ministerially ordaining officers over them, and so maketh them organical also, and adding them into combination with themselves: and this cannot be done as they are particular Officers, for so, they are not to them, Therefore as general, and it is to be accounted an act of the Church-Catholike, as hath been shewed before. *Ch. I. Sect. 4.*

And though in a constant, permanent or continuous integral, whose particular members rise and fall together with the whole, so that it cannot consist but of so many necessary integral, individual parts whereof it is constituted. There the whole, and the parts whereof it doth consist, as they stand in relation unto one another must be *simul*: yet the Church-Catholike being (as I may say) a kinde of *discreet, successive, indefinite integral*, alwaies *transient*, and in *flux*, some members being alwaies in their adding, and some alwaies in departing, so that in respect of the particular parts it is not one hour every way the same it was the former, I say, that in reference to the members that are to be added, the whole must needs be accounted first, because it is constituted and hath a being entitive and organical before the addition, and the members born or converted must needs be first added to the whole, before they can bear the relation of parts unto it. And herein the Church is like unto a Corporation, whose first members whereof it was constituted were *simul natura & tempore* with the whole, yet all the members that are added successively, finde it a Corporation before their addition: and so it is with the successive members of the Church-Catholike.

Object. That which belongs to a similar body or integral, *quâ talis*, it doth not arise from the integrality, but from the nature which is common to the whole, and so it agreeth to it primarily, *quâ talis, non quâ totum, sive integrum*: so though such and such priviledges and Ordinances belong to the whole Church

Church Catholike : yet it is not primarily, *quâ Catholike*, or *quâ* Scot. 6.
an Integral, but *quâ tale*, and so they may belong to the parts pri-
marily, and to the whole secondarily.

Ans. Though the properties of a similar body do belong to
it *quâ tale*, as such, yet the whole being *tale* they agree to the
whole primarily, though they be found immediatly in the parti-
cular parts.

Secondly, The priviledges and Ordinances of the Church do
not belong to the Church primarily *quâ tale*, for it might possi-
bly have had such a nature, and yet wanted such Priviledges and
Ordinances : but they arise *ex institutione & donatione divinâ*,
and from the Covenant between Christ and his Church, and
flow from thence, and that *institution, donation and covenant*,
being first intended and given to the whole, the priviledges
and Ordinances belong first to the whole, and secondari-
ly to the parts, though they be set immediatly in the parts
also.

Now then, seeing it is evident by the former *Scriptures* and
Arguments, that there is a Church-Catholike visible both *Ex-
tensive* and *Organical* : and seeing the *Names, Nature, and Pri-
viledges* of the Church, the *Promises and Ordinances* of God, the
Offices of Christ, the *Signs* of the true Church, the *Members* of
of the Church, and *Ministry* of the word belong first to the
Church-Catholike visible, and that every particular Christian
bears *first and last relation* thereunto, which relation cannot be bro-
ken off by any removal, or without sinne, and that the particular
Churches spring out of the members of the Church-Catholike, I
therefore conclude, according to the light God hath given me,
That the Church-Catholike visible is *Prima*, in Gods intencion, and
by Gods institution, and by Gods donation of Ord-nances and Privi-
ledges, and in dignity and authority, and in perfection, and in nature
and essence, and in ministerial, instrumental causality, and in per-
fect cognition and noscibility : and the particular Churches sec-
ondary or posterior in all the forenamed respects : and likewise are
Orta in regard they are made up of the members of the Church-
Entitive, and are converted instrumentally by the Church-Catho-
like Organical, and intimated and organized by them, and added to
them, and combined with them.

Quest. 2.
Sect. 7.

From this Thesis give me leave to propound to your further consideration these Corollaries or Conclusions.

Concerning { Churches } Catholike.
 { Particular.
 { Persons } Publike, viz. the Officers.
 Private, viz. the Members.

Concerning the Church in general.

1. That there is a Church-Catholike.
2. That the Church-Catholike is but one.
3. That the Church-Catholike is visible.
4. That though the Church-Catholike be alwaies transient and in flux by addition and subtraction of the members thereof, yet it shall never cease to be visible.
5. That if the Church-Catholike be contracted into narrow limits, yet the remaining part thereof conserves both the nature and priviledges of the Church-Catholike, and puts on the notion thereof, more properly then of a particular Church: as a City burnt down or wasted into a few streets, reserves the Charter and Priviledges of the whole; and that which was accounted but a part of it before, now puts on the notion of the whole.
6. That the Church-Catholike is mixt of good and bad, as well as particular Congregations are.
7. That the Church-Catholike may be considered either as Entitive or Organical.
8. That the Church-Catholike is one habitual, organical body, or Integral.
9. That the keys of Discipline are Catholike as well as of Doctrine.
10. That the Church-Catholike is one similar body: if considered as Entitive, the members are similar parts of it, if as organical, the particular Churches are similar parts of it.
11. The Promises, Priviledges, and Ordinances of worship and discipline, belong primarily to the Church-Catholike.
12. That the Church-Catholike is constituted by one Covenant, Charter, and Systeme of Divine Laws.
13. That the Priviledges and Ordinances of the Church arise not from the Nature of it, but from the covenant, donation, and institution of Christ.
14. That

Sec. 7.

14. That the Church-Catholike is the prime Church.
15. That the Church-Catholike visible is of greater dignity then the particular Churches.
16. That the Church-Catholike visible is more august, and of more large authority then the particular: though the authority differs not in kinde.
17. That the Church-Catholike is of greater perfection then the particular Churches.
18. That the Church-Catholike visible is ministerially an instrument to convey the Nature, Priviledges, and Ordinances of the Church to such as are added thereunto.
19. That the whole Church-Catholike is the primary and adequate object (*suo genere*) of Christs Offices, and the particular Churches, but as parts thereof. *Joh. 3. 16.*
20. That the Notes and Signs of the true Church belong first to the Church-Catholike visible, and therefore are distinctive to that only.
21. That the Church-Catholike visible hath an existence, accidents, and operations of its own, as it is Catholike.
22. That the Church-Catholike visible hath an head or governour over it, and but one head, even Jesus Christ, who is very Man as well as God.
23. That though Christ be the only supream head and ruler of his Church, yet hath it immediate rulers over it under Christ.
24. That the unity of the Church-Catholike requireth not a meeting of the whole body together at any time.

Concerning particular Churches.

1. That the particular Churches are made up of the members of the Church-Catholike Entitive.
2. That the particular Churches organized, and all visible beleevers make up the Church-Catholike Organical by aggregation, and the particulars are inferiour thereunto.
3. That the particular divisions of the Church-Catholike visible for convenient enjoyment of publike Ordinances, have the name (Church) and the Priviledges and Ordinances (as far as they are capable of them) secondarily in consideration.
4. That the particular Churches being similar parts of the

Quest. 2.

whole Church, having no essential, specific differences, are to be distinguished by accidental differences and circumstances, as their limits of place, &c. though they be heterogenceal to them.

5. Many Congregations may be in the same community of discipline, and be ruled by their Elders *in communi* by coordination, and so be called one Church, *National, Provincial* or *Presbyterial*.

6. If the particular Churches claim power of dispensing all the Ordinances of Christ, by virtue of the general Charter, Covenant and donation, they being parts of the Church, then much more may the whole Church-Catholike, for which they were primarily intended and made.

7. The greater the parts of the Church-Catholike be, and the more united by combination and coordination, the stronger they be, and the smaller the divisions be, the weaker.

8. The division of the Church-Catholike into small parcels, to stand alone by themselves without coordination, is dangerous.

9. Yet necessity in regard of distance of place, &c. may cause a particular Church to be Independent, and stand alone in regard of actual, external consociation or combination.

10. The necessity of an explicit Covenant, as the essential form whereby the particular Church is constituted, implyeth a denial of all other Churches to be true, that are not so constituted, because they must want the essential form.

11. The ordinary and constant operations of the Officers of the Church in dispensation of Christs Ordinances are in the particular Churches primarily.

12. Any particular Congregation may fail, apostatize, or be dissolved and cease, but should the Church-Catholike be reduced into so narrow limits, and the being thereof be reserved therein, and it sustain the notion of the Church-Catholike, God would not suffer it in such a case to fail or cease, for then the whole must cease also.

Concerning the publike Officers of the Church.

1. Every Minister is an Officer of the Church-Catholike visible, and that relation is primary to him, yet the particular relation

tion he stands in to a particular Congregation, giveth him a more immediate especial call, and charge to administer the Ordinances of God constantly to them. Sect. 7.

2. Any single Minister by vertue of his office hath power ministerially to admit a member into the Church-Catholike visible, if he be fit.

3. Although the election of a Minister to a particular Congregation be an act of liberty in the people, yet his mission is from Christ primarily and ministerially by the Presbytery.

4. He doth not administer the Ordinances of God in the name of the Congregation as their servant, but as the servant of Christ. As a Mayor in a Corporation though chosen by the people, yet executeth his office in the Kings name.

5. If he administreth any Ordinances out of his own Congregation, he doth it not as a gifted brother, but by vertue of his office, 2 Cor. 5. 20. And the like may be said of their dispensation of Ordinances to members of other Congregations that come to their Congregations.

6. Although the particular flock over which a Minister was set be dissolved, yet he ceaseth not to be a Minister, because the Church to which he bare first relation is not dissolved, which is the Catholike.

7. The Elders of severall particular Congregations as they may exercise the keys of their office *divisim*, in their severall Congregations, so they may exercise them *conjunctim*, in combinations, if they be called thereunto.

Concerning private members.

1. Particular converts are first converted into the Church-Catholike Entitive, and secondarily conjoynd into particular confociations, for the more opportune enjoyment of Ordinances actually and constantly.

2. Every member of a particular Congregation is a member of the Church-Catholike Entitive, and that relation doth primarily belong unto him.

3. External profession of the true faith, and subjection to Gods Ordinances, is enough to make a man capable of being a member of the Church-Catholike visible, and so also of
a particular

Quest. 2.

a particular Congregation, *quoad externam formam*.

4. By Baptism members are visibly and ministerially admitted into the Church-Catholike visible.

5. By excommunication rightly administred an offender is cast out of the Church-Catholike visible, as much as out of a particular Congregation.

6. Federal holinesse belongs to none primarily, because born of members of a particular Congregation, but of the Church-Catholike.

7. They that are only in the Church-Catholike visible, are not *without* in the Apostles sense.

8. Children of beleieving parents have right to Baptism, though their parents were not members of any particular Congregation, and are debarred from their due, if denied it.

9. Every visible beleever is or ought to be a member of the particular Church, wherein and among whom he dwelleth.

10. The being in the general Covenant gives right to the Ordinances, and not any particular Covenant, neither do we finde any mention in Scripture of any particular Covenant either urged or used at admission of members into a particular Congregation, or at the constitution thereof.

11. The invisible members of the Church which have internal communion with Christ, are also visible members, and have external communion in external Ordinances.

12. The departure of a member from a particular Congregation, and removal to another for convenience, or by necessity, is no sin, but departing from the Church-Catholike, and ceasing to be a member thereof, is a sin.

Ser. 8.

I know it is not usual to make uses and applications to Theses of this nature, and should I enter thereinto, I might drown my self in sorrow, to bewail the rents, not in Christs seamlesse coat, but in his body the Church, which Christ preferred in some regards before his natural body, for he assumed his natural body for their sakes, and was willing to be crucified for their sakes.

The divisions of the Church are of three sorts, in judgement, in affection, and in way or practice.

For judgement, First come the *Romists*, and they rend away Sect. 8.
the second commandment: then come the *Antisabbatarians*,
and they rend away the fourth, though placed in the heart of
the Decalogue, and so extraordinarily fenced by God, and a
memento set before it, and so many arguments after it: then
come the *Antinomians*, and they pluck away the whole Law
from us, denying it both punitive, coactive, and directive power,
and so render it wholly dead and uselesse to Christians: then
come the *Socinians*, and they quench the Deity of Christ, and
the holy Ghost, and deny our redemption by the blood of Christ,
and so consequently would deprive us of the benefit of the New
Testament: then come the *Anabaptists*, and they deny, and de-
ride our Baptism, and render us and our children no better then
heathens: then come the *Separatists*, and they would pluck up
our Church by the roots, and call us *Rome, Egypt, Sodom, Ba-
bylon*, and so consequently call their mother *Whore*, for if they
have had any conversion, they had it in the bosome of our
Church. Of whom that is too true which the Psalmist saith, *Psa.*
*50.20. Thou sittest and speakest against thy brother, and hast slan-
dered thine own mothers son.* Then come the *Antiscripturists* and
they cashier both Old and New Testament. And then come the
Ante-Trinitarians, and they blaspheme the whole Trinity: And
then come the *Familists*, and they leave the sure rule of the word,
and trust to Satanical delusions and revelations.

Yea, there be others of our honoured and beloved brethren,
whom I forbear to name among the former, who, though they
acknowledge us true Churches, yet deny us to be one Church,
and would have us rent into a thousand pieces and parcels,
and these to stand as so many entire, compleat bodies, without
any coordination, as so many Spouses of Christ, as so many
Queens appointing their own orders and Officers, with liberty
to censure both Officers and members within themselves, by
the votes of the whole body; and not to be accountable unto
any Churches as coordinate members, except arbitrarily. Not
endeavouring with us to reform our Churches, but to gather
Churches out of our Churches, by gathering our best members
out of our Churches, and uniting them into several bodies by a
particular Covenant, though distant far in habitation. But if the

Quest. 2.

cream of our Congregations be flected off, our wheat transplanted by it self into other mens folds, who sowed it not, our fattest sheep gathered into mens folds, it will be very sad for Gods Ministers to have none but the tares, and goats, and lees, and dregs of men left them to look after.

Others would wrest the keys of the Church out of the hands of the Church-Officers, and hang them at the girdle of the civil Magistrate; but seeing God made civil and Ecclesiastical Officers differing in kinde, the one entrusted with a civil Magistracy, the other with an Ecclesiastical Ministry, as it is an usurpation for the Church-Officers, as such, to claim the power of the Magistrate, so I fear it will prove but sacrilege for the civil Magistrate, as such, to claim the power of the Ministry. If *maxima* was so great a fault, I fear *negotiorum* will be as great.

Others there are who plead for liberty of judgement, conscience and practice, that every one may hold, and hold forth what opinions he please, and be of what religion and sect he pleaseth, because judgement and conscience cannot be forced, but must be left to God only, as they say: and thereby they would make *England* another *Amsterdam* of all sects and religions: and some flown so high already as to name that City for an example and pattern of the model they would have in *England*: but I must clear our brethren in *New-England* from this, and commend them for banishing the *Familists*, &c. from amongst them, who would otherwise have utterly overthrown the peace and truth in their Churches.

Yea, generally men covet new opinions, and account it their glory to differ from others in judgement, and he is no body that hath none but old truths; and so men under the colour of new light and new truths, rake up a multitude of old errors.

Secondly, Our divisions are in heart and affections: for difference in judgement causeth alienation of affections, and great thoughts of heart: so that if there prove once a clashing and crossing in opinions, though they were never so neer allied, or well acquainted and familiar, yet then they grow strange, and fall out, and oppose, and censure each other deeply: then they are superstitious, or Antichristian, or enemies to Christs kingly office, and hence come so many invectives in Pulpit and Presse.

Thirdly

Thirdly, Our divisions and differences are in way: for as *Sec. 8.* mens judgements differ, so do their waies. Some are for one way of worship, some for another; some for one way of discipline, some another; some for one way of constituting Churches, some another; some are for gathering of new Churches out of old, and yet let the old ones stand as mock-Churches, when they have gleaned all that are good out of them: they would take all the golden and silver vessels, vessels of honour, and leave none but of wood and stone, vessels of dishonour; And some are for separation wholly, and so turn all the rest over to Antechrist: yea, some so violent, as that they would pluck down our very meeting-houses (tropically called Churches) which they deride by the name of *Steeple-houses*. And all are in waies of contention, so that we are like *Sampsons* foxes tyed together by the tayls with firebrands between them, to burn up the standing corn.

I shall conclude with an earnest desire of, and exhortation to unity and peace. The unity of the Church should be a strong motive to unity in judgement, heart, and way. It is that the Apostle presseth, *Eph. 4.3,4. Endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace: for there is one body, and one spirit, &c.* This spiritual unity is that which Christ so earnestly and often prayed for in that short prayer, *Joh. 17.21,23. That they may be one as we are one, that they all may be one, that they also may be one in us, that they may be made perfect in one.* And this was Pauls prayer, *Rom 15.5,6. Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like minded one towards another, according to Christ Jesus, that ye may with one minde and one mouth glorifie God. &c.* And this was Pauls earnest request, *1 Cor. 1.10. Now I beseech you brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you: but that you be perfectly joynd together in the same minde, and the same judgement.* And again *2 Cor. 13.11. It is one of the last things he concludes his Epistle with, Finally brethren, farewell, be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one minde, live in peace, and the God of love and peace shall be with you. And Phil. 1.27. He presseth it as the only thing he desired of them, Only let your conversation be as becometh the Gospel of Christ, that whether I come and see you, or else be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in*

Quest. 2.

one Spirit with one minde, striving together for the faith of the Gospel. Certainly unity of judgement is of more importance then we are aware of, else the Apostle would not presse it with such solemn adjurations and entreaties, so often as he doth. Yea, when there were but two men that differed in opinion (as it is conceived) the Apostle thought it befitting Apostolical gravity, and the holy Ghost judged it meet for a piece of canonical Scripture to take notice of it, and compose it. *Phil. 4.2. I beseech Evodius, and beseech Syntyche that they be of the same minde in the Lord.* Though it might seem but womens brabbles, yet we know how great a matter a little fire kindleth, a little strife and error will encrease to more ungodlinesse.

Consider we, that there is but one truth, and that is of God, and God is truth, and error is of the devil.

Consider, that the understanding is the highest and foremost faculty of the soul, it is as the forehorse in the team, the leading faculty; and as that is enformed, so the will and conscience, and affections must needs work, and follow that, and if that be led into error, it must necessarily misleade the whole man.

Consider, that a chief part of the image of God in man consisteth in knowledge, and so is upon the understanding, which by error is defaced.

Remember, the solemn caveats given by the Apostle, *Rom. 16. 17. I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such serve not the Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly, and by good words, and blessed or fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.* And *Eph. 4.14. That we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every winde of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftinesse (or after the methods of error) whereby they lie in wait to deceive.* Christ himself tells us, that false Prophets shall come that shall deceive (if it were possible) the very elect. Behold, I have told you before, *Mat. 20.30,31.* And Paul tells us, *Of your selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw disciples after them; Therefore watch, Act. 20.30,31.* Therefore hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, saith Paul, *2 Tim. 1.13.* They

that coin new words, and new strange expressions to amaze the Sect. 8. people, it is a sign, as Calvin tells us, that they have some new opinion upon the Anvil.

O let us labour to be of one heart, seeing we are all but one body, and have but one head, and one spirit, and because we are all brethren, children of the same heavenly Father. This is that which God hath promised his people, *Ezek. 11.19. I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you.* And we finde Christ inculcating this exhortation, *Joh. 13.34. A new Commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, as I have loved you, that ye also love another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another, Joh. 13.34,35.* Again, *This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you, Joh. 15.12. and vers. 17. These things I command you that you love one another.* And this I finde practised, *Act. 4.31. And the multitude of them that beleeved were of one heart and one soul.* And this Paul exhorteth to, *Rom. 12.10. Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love, in honour preferring one another.* And we finde the unity both of judgement and heart exhorted unto, *1 Pet. 3.8. Finally, be ye all of one minde, having compassion one of another, love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous.*

Division is the devils musick, but that which makes the devil laugh, should make us cry. O what a solemn obsecration is that of Paul, *Phil. 2.1,2. If there be any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies, fulfil ye my joy, that ye may be like minded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one minde.*

O that we might labour to be of one way also. This is that which God promised his people, *Jer. 32.39. I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them, and of their children after them.* And *Zep. 3.9. Then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord with one consent, or one shoulder.* And this was the blessing that God gave Hezekiah in his people, *2 Chron. 30.12. Also in Judah the hand of God was to give them one heart to doe the commandment*

Quest. 2.

of the King, and of the Princes by the Word of the Lord.

Certainly there is but one rule for doctrine, worship, discipline. And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and on all the Israel of God, Gal. 6. 16. And this is the Apostles exhortation, Roman. 15. 6. *That ye may with one minde and one mouth glorifie God*, Yea, though we be not of the same judgement in every thing, yet as it is Philip. 3. 16. *Whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us minde the same things.*

And this unity in way is that which we have sworn unto, and covenanted in our late *National League and Covenant*, in the first branch of it. *That we shall endeavour to bring the Churches of God in the three Kingdomes of England, Scotland and Ireland, to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in Religion, Confession of Faith, Form of Church-government, Directory for Worship and Catechizing; That we and our posterity after us may as brethren live together in faith and love, and that the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us.* And we shall all be forsworn, if we endeavour it not.

All the members of the same body natural agree to goe the same way, Yea, the strength, health, and beauty of the body natural, consisteth in the fast knitting of all the members together to each other, and to the head, and the luxation thereof is dangerous: so and much more it is in a body politick or Ecclesiastical. And though the divisions in our civil estate be very sad, and might deserve tears of blood to bewail them, yet I look upon the divisions in the Church as a matter of more sad and doleful consequence, and I fear (but wish I might be mistaken) that when the breaches of the Commonwealth shall be closed, the breaches in the Church may grow wider, and the differences rise higher: and such errors are sown among us as will not be plucked up again in our age: which having seized upon the understandings and consciences of men, cannot be composed by commands, nor clubbed down by force. Only here is my comfort, that though our condition is such, that we know not what to ask, yet God is wise, and knows what to bestow. And this is my hope herein, that he

which found a way to reconcile God and man, when they were *Sec. 8.*
at enmity, can finde way to reconcile man and man, though
they be at difference. Now the God of peace that brought again
from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great shephcard of
the sheep, through the bloud of the everlasting Covenant, make
us perfect in every good work to doe his will, working
in us that which is well-pleasing in his sight,
through Iesus Christ, to whom
be glory for ever and
ever. Amen.

* *

FINIS.
